MEN AND MOVEMENTS IN THE CHURCH

F. A. IREMONGER

4.22.29.

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCETON, N. J.

PURCHASED BY THE
MRS. ROBERT LENOX KENNEDY CHURCH HISTORY FUND.

BX 5101 .I7 1928
Iremonger, Frederic.
Men and movements in the church

MEN AND MOVEMENTS IN THE CHURCH

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO. LTD.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.4
6 OLD COURT HOUSE STREET, CALCUTTA
53 NICOL ROAD, BOMBAY
167 MOUNT ROAD, MADRAS

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
55 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
221 EAST 20TH STREET, CHICAGO
TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON
210 VICTORIA STREET, TORONTO

MEN AND MOVEMENTS IN THE CHURCH

A Series of Interviews

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 22 1929
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BY THE

Rev. F. A. IREMONGER M.A.

VICAR OF VERNHAM DEAN AND CHAPLAIN TO THE KING

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
LONDON • NEW YORK • TORONTO
1928

Made in Great Britain

PREFACE

With two exceptions these interviews appeared in the *Guardian* during my editorship, and they are here collected at the request of many who read them: I am grateful to the Editor of the *Guardian* for permission to reprint them. The last two have not been published before. The interview with the Bishop of Birmingham was the result of a desire to know something of his constructive teaching, which has naturally attracted less public attention, and is less familiar to churchpeople, than his more critical utterances. Dr. Guy Warman kindly allowed me to have a talk with him after the House of Commons had rejected the Amended Deposited Prayer-book, and to hear something of his hopes and plans for the future.

The reason for publishing the collection is that it may help some churchpeople, who could not be persuaded to investigate at first hand the many movements and developments that are to-day influencing the life and witness of the Church, to know that these movements exist, and to understand a little of their aims and methods. And, though the interview with Lord Hugh Cecil may 'date' a little, I have left it substantially unaltered, as it gives the views of a leader of the Church Assembly who is not unmindful of the daily work and difficulties of the parish priest.

Two words may be added. The absence will be noticed of any attempt to deal with wider movements

in the Church such as Anglo-Catholicism, Liberal Evangelicalism—for the Bishop of Birmingham can hardly be counted a typical Liberal Evangelical—and the Student Christian Movement. The need for studying them is amply supplied in several recent books, and their philosophical, historical and social background does not lend itself to the treatment here adopted. Also, no mention is made of those movements in which the decisive part is played by women. A similar collection concerning these might be useful, if a woman would undertake it, at a time when the whole subject of women's work in the Church is provoking much thought and debate.

F. A. I.

VERNHAM DEAN VICARAGE,
HUNGERFORD,
August, 1928.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Dean of St. Paul's	1
The Rev. P. T. B. Clayton, M.C.	12
The Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Temple)	23
The Rev. G. A. Studdert-Kennedy, M.C.	36
The Dean of Canterbury	46
The Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard	57
The Bishop of St. Albans	69
Dr. Cyril Norwood	79
The Rt. Hon. Lord Hugh Cecil, M.P.	91
The Rev. Prebendary Wilson Carlile	103
Dr. Joseph Wells	113
The Bishop of Birmingham	126
The Bishop of Chelmsford (Dr. Warman)	145

MEN AND MOVEMENTS

THE DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S

THERE are two things about St. Paul's Churchyard that always fascinate—the pigeons, which provide the best of free entertainments for the Londoner's dinner-hour; and the corner shop where you can buy, according to your taste, a guide to London or curious little pamphlets describing 'Idolatry up to Date' and 'The Two Babylons.' But neither of these is as interesting as the Deanery House, one of the simplest buildings that Christopher Wren ever designed—and first occupied, it is said, by Sancroft—its sash-windowed and dormered front relieved from dullness by a hooded doorway, with jambs elaborately carved, and by the double stairway of stone protected by an iron railing which leads to the front door. In the courtyard you walk on cobbles laid long ago, and two plane trees survive in which, within living memory, rooks have nested. Inside, to the left of the panelled entrance halls, is the large and rather gloomy room which was the study of Richard William Church and, perhaps, of other famous deans. But it is in a long alcoved gallery upstairs, which was added in the eighteenth century, that Dr. Inge does his work; and here, in an atmosphere of peace and restfulness, contrasting strangely with the hubbub of the City beneath it, I spent an hour one Saturday morning with the Dean.

Our talk began with the duty of the Church in regard to the Social Problem and its relation to religion.

C.S.U., Copec, I.C.F.—were these movements signs of a healthy development of thought and life within the Church, or were they attempts to invade a sphere in which religion had no place?

'I can answer that question quite definitely,' said Dr. Inge. 'Our Lord refused to adopt the position of an arbitrator when worldly things were in dispute. "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" Can you have a more pointed disclaimer than that?'

'But does not the teaching of our Lord, taken as a whole, suggest that He would have been on the side of the social reformers to-day?'

'Our Lord's gospel,' was the reply, 'was not a gospel of social reform at all, but of spiritual regeneration. He told people, without distinction of class, to beware of covetousness; that a man's life did not consist in material abundance; and that there is great danger, as well as great responsibility, attached to the possession of riches. Christian social reformers should remember that social conditions such as those under which we live to-day are utterly different from those in Palestine at the time of our Lord's life on earth; and that it is fantastic to claim support from His teaching for any social or economic theory to-day. No political point of view is necessarily that of Christianity or the Church, and it is not the duty of the Church to impose an economic theory on its members. How can it be, when you consider the sharp divisions that exist between Christian men on economic and political questions? Let the Church remember her true task, which is to teach the "transvaluation of all values."'

'You don't, then, regard the Labour Movement as inspired by Christian ideals?'

'I am more interested in its practical results. The Labour Movement to-day is dominated by Syndicalism, which is an utterly undemocratic conception, and preaches the class war. This Christians should condemn with all their power. The failure of the general strike

was a blow to Syndicalism, and the apostles of the class war have now only one weapon left—Ca' canny or sabotage.'

I was interested to hear, after this decisive judgment, that the Dean was almost as emphatic in his disapproval of Fascism.

'It is true that Italy owes a great debt to Mussolini; at the moment of his coming into power 2000 communes had hoisted the Red Flag, and he saved Italy from ruin. Popular government is only possible where there is national loyalty and unity. But Fascism is a tyranny, as Bolshevism is; when society is threatened by the latter, it must protect itself through the former. When both disappear, Liberalism has its chance. But Liberalism is a fair-weather creed, and is useless in a house divided against itself.'

'One more question,' I said, 'before we leave the Social Problem. You are often quoted in the secular Press as a whole-hearted believer in Eugenics. Is that so?'

'It depends on what you mean by Eugenics. I disagreed with the Eugenics Society on the point of sterilisation. But when you note the fertility of the feeble-minded, and compare the birth-rate among the professional and among the working classes, or in the boroughs (let us say) of Finsbury and Westminster, can you be satisfied that nothing should be done to attempt to redress the balance?'

'What, then, is your remedy?' I asked.

'My own personal view is probably too drastic for adoption. I would suggest that the State should educate freely only three children of the same parents, and make the parents pay fees for the rest. I am in favour of medical certificates being taken out before marriage, though this would probably have to be done voluntarily, and could not be made compulsory, at first. I would also remove all obstacles to a right knowledge of methods of birth control among the poor, and I signed the resolution

in favour of Lord Buckmaster's motion which was carried some time ago in the House of Lords. But the whole question is one of immense difficulty, in which a careful training of the Christian conscience is needed.'

We passed from the Social Problem to the Church, and my next question concerned institutional religion. The Roman Church, Dr. Inge thinks, is gaining ground only slightly in England, though it is a great power in the United States, more (on the whole) for evil than good. I was not surprised to hear that he considers the Establishment safer now than it was twenty years ago.

'The danger of an attack on the Established Church has lessened. That danger was most serious when the dissenting middle classes were in power. With the growth of democracy, it has died down. Nor would the Labour Party think it worth while to loot a few million pounds from the Church when they could get it with less trouble and opposition elsewhere.'

'You would admit,' I interrupted, 'that there is a growing desire within the Church for a greater freedom from State control?'

'Yes—that is a more serious danger to Establishment. But opinion within the Church is very much divided. The Anglo-Catholics, it is true, would welcome disestablishment rather than have their aims threatened by the secular power. But Liberals and most Evangelicals would wish to preserve the State connection; and, personally, I am in favour of at least as much national recognition of religion as is implicit in the present system.'

Of the Church Assembly the Dean would say little, except that it was 'unrepresentative and unmanageable. No deliberative assembly ought to have more than four hundred members.'

I put to him the question that has always worried me since I read the first list of those who were elected to the Assembly—whether there was not a grave danger of the

intellectual and the administrative side of the Church's work being divorced from each other, and whether by some means a larger number of the more thoughtful clergy and laity in the Church ought not to find a place in it.

'Thoughtful persons are the last people they want on it,' was the brief reply; and I passed on to discuss the present position and future prospects of the various groups and parties in the Church.

Dr. Inge agreed that the old school of Evangelicals is dying—'for one obvious reason. Their foundations have been knocked from under them. The progress of knowledge has killed the theory of verbal inspiration, which was their chief corner-stone, and people are now indifferent to lurid threats and gaudy promises about the future life.'

'But there is a new school of Evangelicals,' I suggested, 'who are represented by the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement. Do you think that there is a future for such a group?'

'Certainly. And I believe it is gaining strength. Its movements are at present a little hampered by the remnants of the old gang which holds the purse-strings; but I am sure it is on the right lines and emphasises the really spiritual aspect of the Gospel. Yes, I think,' the Dean added, in answer to a further question, 'that it has at present a greater following among the laity than among the clergy.'

'And what of Anglo-Catholicism?'

'It is a highly organised political body, as Catholicism always is. It is true, as you suggest, that they have stirred up new life in many parishes, but it is their teaching and preaching that make me uneasy. This seems to me to be, for the most part, materialist and magical—I don't like the word, but the importance attached by the more advanced Anglo-Catholics to Reservation suggests that they regard spiritual forces as capable of being literally contained in matter.'

Dr. Inge left me in no doubt of his own opinion on

Reservation. 'I would forbid it altogether. It is a sub-Christian form of devotion.'

'But surely,' I asked, 'Anglo-Catholics, as a whole, teach a spiritual interpretation of sacramentalism?'

'Perhaps. But if you once begin making concessions to the lower forms of religion, you lower the whole system. The High Church party of fifty years ago would have been horrified at modern developments.'

'Do you think that the movement has any future before it?'

'Possibly; but only as part of a general revival of what I should call superstition.'

But the future of religion is of more importance than the state of parties within the Anglican Church, and I was anxious to discover whether Dr. Inge saw any new rallying-point for the forces of the spirit, and any new means of reconciliation. For Heiler, whom he introduced to English readers, the Dean expressed much admiration, but little sympathy with his position. 'His is an anti-rational foundation of religion, and I do not see much hope along these lines, nor on those of the Catholic modernists.'

'And what of Christian Platonism?' I asked, with Dr. Inge's well-known book in my mind.

'The doctrine of the Christian Platonists will always be held by a few.'

'But could you not say more than that? Is there not at least the possibility of a fresh—and perhaps a reconciling—interpretation of sacramentalism in the Platonic idea that there is an underlying spiritual reality in the universe?'

'In one sense, perhaps. But not in the sense that the spiritual reality is tied to the material object, or that the material object is indispensable as a channel of sacramental grace.'

'But you would admit that the Sacraments can at least be "effective symbols" and "aids to worship"?'

'Yes. The later Platonists were not anti-sacramentalists. Proclus, for instance, was initiated in all the mysteries, and spent a great part of the day in worship.'

'Do you think that such a philosophy will meet the difficulties felt in modern minds about the Christian religion?'

'The difficulties are chiefly connected with the non-religious appeal, the promises and threats of the Church, about which I hope to have something to say before you leave. I do not think that recent discoveries have made spiritual religion more difficult now than it was hundreds of years ago.'

'But does not the old idea of the supernatural create difficulties for modern thought?'

'Only if by that you mean the miraculous—the idea of two orders in the world, interfering with and overlapping each other. Such a conception, for instance—as I have written elsewhere—as that cholera can be caused either by a defective water supply or by the blasphemies of an infidel mayor, cannot be accepted by scientific minds. The idea of the two orders is possibly essential to Catholicism, but not to Christianity.'

'Does not this involve, then, a new idea of revelation?'

'Not if you hold the view of revelation that I do. Revelation requires two people, one to speak and one to hear. Nothing can be revealed that the hearer is incapable of receiving. Remember Goethe's answer to the words "It is not God who speaks, but your own heart"—"It is only through our hearts that God speaks to us." It is difficult to say where the Holy Spirit leaves off and human nature begins.'

We talked for a little on mysticism, and the Dean spoke of the underlying unity in the mystic experiences of all ages. 'The heart of true religion,' he said, 'is in the experience of the mystics; it is independent of the intellectual form in which it is expressed, for many

a mystic has not been a philosopher '—but I was anxious to hear Dr. Inge's views on the intellectual difficulties that are felt to-day, and how he thought the Church might best solve them.

'No,' he said, in reply to a question, 'you cannot have a standardised creed for all alike. It is impossible to impose the faith of the charcoal burner on everybody.'

'Can you impose it on the clergy?'

'I do not think that you can. A certain latitude is essential, but I am of opinion that liberal thought in the Church of England has as much toleration to-day as we have any right to expect.'

'May I ask you,' I broke in, 'one practical question? Take such a difficulty as that of believing in the Virgin Birth. If you were a bishop, what line would you take with Ordination candidates who did not accept this article of the Creed?'

'If I were a bishop—which God forbid!—I would be at great pains to study the foundation of the man's faith. If this were sound, I should regard belief in a physical miracle as a matter of minor importance. But I make a distinction between teachers and learners. I would say that, if such a man were ordained, he must leave the subject alone in the pulpit and lay emphasis on other things. He must not deny it.'

'You would not object, then, to an attitude of reverent agnosticism on this point?'

'No; we know so little of ultimate truth that we must be content with those parts of the truth which we can make our own.'

'Can there be, in your view, any standard of orthodoxy?' I asked.

'Yes—belief in the Divinity of Christ. A man may be religious without holding that; but, as a Christian teacher, he must believe it. Otherwise his preaching would be utterly ineffective. You can't make bricks without straw, especially in the pulpit.'

'In short, the ancient creeds must stand?'

'Well, they are not quite intact, are they, in their original sense? We do not interpret ascent into heaven and descent into hell as our forefathers did a thousand years ago; but the Divinity of Christ, I repeat, is essential.'

My last request was for a statement of the Dean's own religious standpoint.

'At the bottom of my whole view,' he said, 'is the conviction that from the first the Church made two great appeals to irreligious motives. First, it tried to bribe and terrify by pictures of future bliss and torment, on which I find comparatively small emphasis laid in the teaching of our Lord and St. Paul. And, secondly, there has been a persistent attempt to secularise the Christian message. These irreligious appeals are much weakened to-day. The country does not really trust the priest in politics. The spiritual appeal is not weaker, nor likely to become so. The things that are unseen are eternal, and these things are with us if we choose to live among them.'

'But is not this a little hard on the multitude? Does it not make religion rather eclectic?'

'Morally, yes; but not intellectually. Has there ever been a time when the Church has preached faithfully and has been popular? All our Lord's words seem to imply that His teaching would only appeal to a few, whether poor or rich, and I know nothing which leads me to suppose that there will ever be an inconvenient crowd round the Narrow Gate.'

Two memories were mine when I left the Deanery on that day. One was of the first time I read some words which frequent quotation has long since made familiar. A great friend, who knew my tastes, put into my hands, nearly twenty years ago, a copy of the 1906 edition of 'Aylwin'—loveliest and eeriest of books!—in the preface to which the author pays tribute to Dr. Robertson

Nicoll's ' remarkable discourse ' on ' The Renascence of Wonder in Religion.' Here I first read that most beautiful of the Logia—' Let not him that seeketh cease from his search until he find, and when he finds he shall wonder. Wondering, he shall reach the Kingdom, and when he reaches the Kingdom he shall have rest.' And I felt that if ever there was a clergyman in the Church of England of whom these words might be true, it was of Dr. Inge. Here was a seeker, persistent, never ceasing from his search, ever full of wonder ; here was one who had gained a place in the Kingdom of the Spirit, and so—in mind and soul—had found rest.

The second memory was of a different kind. I was back again in a small room, lit by a noisy gas-mantle that had long outlived its usefulness, in the East India Dock Road. My first rector, in his wisdom—not the least of his gifts for which I have lived to thank God—let his curates join whatever society they pleased, so long as they carried out faithfully their duties as parish priests. And, as a member of the Poplar Labour League, I attended the monthly ' study-night ' (I think we called it) of the League. There would be about ten or a dozen of us present on those nights. Will Crooks would look in—Will Crooks, the only man (except Ben Tillett) who could hold a Sunday morning audience at the dock gates after the public-houses had opened at one o'clock (and many a docker would not have enjoyed his Sunday dinner if he had not first heard the usual formula of dismissal, ' And now, comrades, let's get 'ome to the turkey and sausages ')—and there would be others, some of whom became, and are now, men of note in local and national politics. Mazzini was our study on the evening on which I look back. There was only one copy between us all ; we passed it from hand to hand and read it aloud. And a dock labourer—how ' red ' we thought him then ; he would be considered the palest of salmon-pink to-day ! —read slowly, ever so slowly, with the conviction of one

whose preface might be ' Thus saith the Lord,' Mazzini's burning sentences on the righteousness that exalts a nation. . . . And I longed for him to meet the Dean of St. Paul's. Could I have found any link between them? Will the Kingdom ever suffer violence as this docker and millions like him take it by force? (' When he saw the multitude he had compassion on them.' Was it because they *could* not or *would* not hear? . . . When we have answered that question we shall perhaps understand the Gospel better!) Or had I heard in the Deanery study on that morning the spiritual death-knell of the multitude—' There will never be an inconvenient crowd round the Narrow Gate '?

THE REV. P. T. B. CLAYTON, M.C., PADRE OF TOC H.

It was a very busy afternoon, I remember; and an unconventional signal told me that I was wanted. The admirable man-of-all-work—who tended the rectory garden and mowed the lawn, cleaned my boots and my motor cycle, fed and killed my pigs and milked my cow—had instructions that, if callers arrived who could not be persuaded that I was busy, he was to tap on my study window with a trowel handle, and I should know that the situation was beyond his control.

'There's a young man to see you, Rector,' he began, when I had pulled up the window. A few years spent within walking distance of 'The Plain' and its war-time and post-war population had made me a little distrustful of young men who called at the rectory.

'Tell him I'm very sorry, but . . .'

'No, he wouldn't rightly be that kind of young man; though what kind of young man he might be, 'twould be main 'ard to say. And he don't seem likely to go, neither,' he added, in a whisper.

I saw that I should get no peace till the mystery of the young man was solved. . . . This did not take long.

'Ah! There you are. Good! Last night I was at —where was it?—Tidworth, I think; and I knew you weren't far off, so I came along. And I want to borrow a piece of your motor bike: mine doesn't seem as complete as when I started. And that's a very untidy-looking shrubbery just inside your drive. And at least four of the stones round the edge of it were once part of your church, before it was restored. Why don't you put them back? And how do I get to Portsmouth?'

It would need a more realistic pen than mine to describe in detail the motor cycle which was emitting the strangest noises and smells on my lawn ; nobody but a mechanical genius could have driven it a hundred yards. And those who know the Rev. P. T. B. Clayton, M.C., will understand that—distinctive as is the full-dress uniform of Toc H.—a stranger who met him in undress ' rig ' might be forgiven for finding it ' main 'ard to say ' what kind of a young man he was. . . . And that was the first time I talked of Toc H. with its Padre.

Seven years later I left the Inner Circle of Mark Lane Station, and crossed the road to the church of All Hallows, Barking-by-the-Tower. Ignoring the very large and rather personal notice, ' Habits are at first cobwebs, at last cables,' which caught my eye on the strip in front of the church—' about five by two,' as a practical picture-frame maker from the Isle of Dogs, on a Whitsun Monday excursion to Oxford, once summarised the spiritual impression made on him by ' The Light of the World ' in Keble Chapel—I noticed a direction signal in the form of a painted inscription and a pointing finger, intended to help the visitor on his way—' To the Upper Porch Room, where you will find one of us waiting to welcome you, provided you don't want money.'

In this room, ' hung about ' (like the ' fine old English gentleman's ' hall) ' with pikes, and guns and bows ' and relics of more recent war, I found Mr. Clayton, who at once took me down the stairs again and into the church, before he would say anything about Toc H. Indeed, the story of the church took so long in the telling (for the Padre is no mean archæologist) that I wondered how much time we should have to talk of his work. I heard how, more than twelve hundred years ago—four centuries before William began to build his Tower of London—a wooden church had been where we were standing ; how next had followed a Norman building, of which the nave piers still remain ; how Richard Cœur

de Lion built his Lady Chapel, and the pilgrims used to throng to it in the belief that the King's heart (buried at Rouen) lay beneath the altar; how William Penn was baptised here, and Laud's death was entered in the burial register ('William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, beheaded,' I read on a sheet from which one word had obviously been erased—a pious act of the Archbishop's nephew, who scratched the word 'traitor' from the page when he was appointed Vicar). I was shown, too, the little brass over the body of George Snayth, 'sometime auditor to William Laud'—*Mors mihi lucrum* was the inscription he chose—who had longed to rest near his master, little knowing that the Archbishop's body would be taken to St. John's, Oxford—'and I believe,' said Mr. Clayton with a twinkle, 'that they've lost it!'

But I would not give the impression that the church is a mere museum; on the contrary, never was a house of worship that throbbed more vividly with life. Round the walls and in odd corners were photographs, framed letters, and pictures; and here was the *Liber Vitae*, beautifully inscribed by the church artist with the names of the Elder Brethren who were members of the first Toc H. at Poperinghe—and three swords.

'You don't mind swords in a church, do you?' Mr. Clayton asked. 'After all, nowadays they could only be used for toasting-forks, and there's something very clean about them. And they are the right shape.' We passed to the tomb of Sir John Croke—on which now rest the Casket and the first Lamp of Maintenance, given by the Prince of Wales—'Here is the sword of a crusader. And this'—he stooped and picked another from the steps of the sanctuary—'is the sword of a knight. And here is the sword of Edmund Street, the "Canadian Gilbert Talbot," sent by his mother to hang in All Hallows. It was his sister,' the Padre added, 'who sent the first £10 to the Service Candidates' Fund, which I believe in the end reached half a million.'

'And now,' I began . . .

'No, not yet. There are just two more things you must see. This door—middle of the fourteenth century. Years ago they wanted to widen the street, so they sliced off the turret like a bit of cheese; but I had an idea that the doorway must be there, and put a chisel through a crack in the panelling: and when we took the panels off, there it was. But here'—and we walked up the south aisle past the font with its superb Grinling Gibbons cover—'is something even more wonderful. . . . You are now standing in a vault that has not been opened since the sixteenth century.' We had groped our way down some stone stairs, at the bottom of which men were busy throwing up earth into the churchyard. 'How did I find it? A mixture of nature, reason, and grace, I expect. Look at this vaulting: possibly thirteenth century; probably fourteenth; but soon, I hope, there will be a chapel here, with steps leading down to it from the south aisle; and some day we may even know whether there is a crypt under the choir.'

At this point I insisted that we should go up to the Padre's room, and on the way I asked why the Lady Chapel was filled with wreaths. 'Ah! You've forgotten: one soon forgets. This is an anniversary; July 1st, 1916. Seven hundred and fifty Queen's Westminsters went into action on the Somme. None was taken prisoner . . . a hundred and fifty came back. A desperate and forlorn hope; no chance of gaining an inch of ground. They had to remove the pressure from somewhere: Verdun, I expect. And that's a parable. The Church has to make these "holding attacks" every day. . . . And yet we are always crying out for results.'

We climbed about eighty stairs, and in the garret which serves as the Padre's private room, from which you look down on Tower Hill, I began my questions. What was it all about? What was the objective of

Toc H.? What was behind these curious symbols and ceremonies, 'which leave on the mind of the uninitiated,' I explained, 'a confused impression of dark-blue blazers, flannel trousers, lamps, a song of which the refrain is "Roger-um," and an atmosphere of general heartiness'? I had not forgotten Gilbert Talbot—could anybody who had ever met him? (The last time I saw him was when I dined with him in his rooms in Long Wall Street, and he had declaimed at length to me on the attitude taken up by the old evening *Westminster Gazette* on the subject of divorce.) And I knew also that Toc H. would have been called Talbot House, had not the name already belonged to a Settlement in South London; and that Toc H. was the army signaller's way of pronouncing the letters T.H. . . .

'No; put the flannel trousers and the lamps out of your mind for a bit; and get back to the philosophy of it all. Listen. Out of the Crimea came the Red Cross Society, out of the South African War came the Scouts, out of the Great War came Toc H.; and the only thing that can make that war worth while is that from the death of millions there should spring up a great religious revival. Everyone is hoping for such a revival; but it waits for the re-harnessing of the men between twenty and thirty. Without them, as history shows, revivals never come.'

'What do you mean,' I asked, 'by re-harnessing?'

'Well, who isn't talking and writing about the alienation of young men from the Church? That's our problem; to bring them into line again. And it will never be done until we all understand that the Church is trying to use a machine which was intended to deal with a condition of domestic stability, rather than with a population caught continually in a vast economic flux. Archbishop Theodore never contemplated the problem of mobility. In his day, where people were, there they "stayed put." But during the war what we chiefly discovered was that, from early in their 'teens onwards,

most men had only known parsons when they were off duty. The public school boy, for instance, confirmed at his school, knew next to nothing about his parish priest. To-day the average boy of sixteen or seventeen finds his life caught between two vast forces which the Church has hardly attempted to study or to sanctify. The first is the centripetal force that draws men into the towns; some fifty thousand boys a year come from school into the great cities, where every evil is open to them and most good is shut. And the second is the expulsive force which is flinging Englishmen all over the globe. . . . I believe that we are on the right lines. Y.M.C.A. had started on an older system of ideas. Their religious system was a negative one. The idea was to attract young men and then keep them under a good influence. They were people to be *worked upon.* Toc H. says that every man by prevenient grace is a *co-operator* in the Kingdom. So he is: the average young man is very shy of being thought good, but he is just as shy of being thought selfish.'

I must not pretend that these sentences were spoken exactly in the order in which I have given them. Mr. Clayton talks at a great pace; and I was not sorry when we were interrupted for a moment by a young man who appeared in the doorway.

'Come in and sit down; but you mustn't talk. Here, drink this'—and the Padre held out a glass of milk which, with some tomato sandwiches, was apparently to be his mid-day meal.

'No, thanks, I have only just finished lunch.'

'Don't argue; drink it'—and the young man obeyed. I felt very glad that Mr. Clayton is 'on the side of the angels,' for the influence of one who can persuade a fellow-man to drink half a pint of cold milk immediately after lunch will never be negligible.

'Let me see,' he went on, turning to me, 'where was I? I know—co-operation in the Kingdom. That is the meaning of the men's work. We talk of "holding" the

young men : but this is a complex which was certainly not in the mind of our Lord. It was a difficulty which did not occur to Him. There must be some great misinterpretation of Christianity in the mind of those who regard young fellows as naturally hostile or indifferent. So we are simply trying to pursue the meaning of our Lord's summary for the post-adolescent—' They that do the will of God shall know the doctrine.' By surrender of their spare time these chaps are learning to run errands for God, and that impulse is part of the social code in Toc H. which they may not break : they would soon be in Queer Street if they disobeyed their Jobmaster. And this further : the young man finds his influence is weak, and that he can't do the best work under his own steam. Thus he is driven back on the power of neglected prayer. Nearly all his evening prayers have so far been about himself, *e.g.* being saved from temptation, and so on. This is almost the whole of his self-examination, instead of " Have I done any good ? " We want a religion of courage as well as a religion of consolation. Toc H. is an attempt to interpret Christianity as a religion for the adolescent, as well as for children and old people.'

' Social work of some kind, then, is a condition of membership ? ' I asked.

' Absolutely. In each area there is one central man, as chief Jobmaster, who controls and directs ; under him are anything up to fifty other Jobmasters, amateurs with real knowledge and experience. Each of these in his turn controls fifty to a hundred men. With regard to the work that they do, we discourage superficial jobs like collecting money. It is all meant to be a man-hunt on the part of Christianity, with the idea of forming character rather than altering circumstances. But take these Jobmasters' reports home with you, and look at them '—and Mr. Clayton tossed across the table half a dozen typed sheets. I have read them since ; they were reports of members who were scoutmasters and managers

of boys' clubs; who ran parish musical societies and worked in casual wards, hospitals, police courts and prisons; who visited juvenile offenders and the blind and the deaf—and did a hundred other jobs which there is no space to record.

But there never yet was a movement that started without the inspiration of the 'official' Church, which has not been regarded with certain misgivings by the parochial clergy; and I asked Mr. Clayton to tell me of the connexion between the members of Toc H. and their parish priest.

'I'm glad you asked me that,' was the reply. 'We see the danger that Toc H. may become competitive instead of being ancillary, and we are determined that it shall not be so. From the beginning there has been a rule that, apart from the Birthday Festival Services, no services are held in the House chapels on Sunday; and men are encouraged to go to their parish church. Dozens of clergy are thankful that we have a branch in their parish. Ask the Bishop of Manchester what he thinks of Pat Leonard; he'll tell you that he's the best "stand-off half" in the diocese. A good parson can use our men as a great power of service and support for the whole life of the parish, and practically no complaint has ever reached us from parish priests, though we would gratefully welcome any criticism. In the growth of a great organism, with virtually no headquarters (in the sense of a large paid staff), slight friction is sometimes inevitable; but the spirit of Toc H. is such that the little group at the centre would regard it as a real act of kindness to have any cases of difficulty made known. It would be a heart-breaking tragedy if Toc H. became secular or anti-clerical. The Church of England has been the chief investor in Toc H. It began it, and has taken the principal part.'

'But Toc H.,' I interrupted, 'includes members of other denominations?'

'Yes; Presbyterians support it, so do Congregationalists; and there are several hundred Roman Catholic members in England. Overseas, R.C. chaplains are attached for Roman Catholic members in several areas, and in Bombay one group entirely Indian is also entirely Roman Catholic; and the chaplain there is a Portuguese Jesuit who was admitted to Toc H. by a Presbyterian! Tampering with the religious convictions of individual members is taboo.'

I wanted to hear something of the organisation of the movement, with its 500 honorary padres, its Groups and Branches and Houses, and the awarding of the Lamp which is given to a Group only when it can point to a good record of corporate service; and one detail after another was explained to me; but—

'Yes, I know all about that,' said the Padre; 'but you must spare a bit more space to explain that in our Houses we have every sort and kind of men living cheek by jowl. We like to mix them up as much as possible; if, for instance, you get too many medical students in one House, the carving knives begin to disappear. And each man pays on a sliding scale, according to his earnings. In one House we have two men sharing the same room, one paying four guineas a week and the other seven and sixpence. The average is twenty in a House, with ten guest-beds which are reserved for men who are looking for work or running away from it. Toc H. is meant to be the biggest Friendly Society of its age.'

At the end of two hours spent with Mr. Clayton, I could see the source of much of the inspiration that lay behind the work, and inevitably my mind recurred to the many 'one-man shows' that I had seen spring up, and flourish, and die. I put the question as gently as I could, knowing how much he would hate it.

'No,' he answered with conviction, 'we have no doubt about the future. This work doesn't depend in the least on myself. There is a universal consciousness in the

youngest member that he is building something of which he will only live to see a small part fulfilled. Membership is on the sternest lines. It is becoming difficult to join. A genuine selection is going on, which is to lay the foundation of an aristocracy of comradeship and service. There are several places, *e.g.* in the Dominions, where dozens more groups could be formed, and there are Houses with twenty members where a hundred are trying to get in. There is no assimilation until there is work for everyone to do. The House is a team and not a waiting-room. Everything depends on the magnetism within the groups. God grant that the movement may last as long as He needs it!'

I have heard Toc H. described by an admirer as one of the few good results of the War that are likely to last; and I am rather more than half inclined to believe it. One thing struck me with quite extraordinary force—that in the Toc H. church and porch-room you could never forget the War, yet there was none of the aggressiveness of a German tank, for instance, exposed on the Front at a seaside resort, none of the sentimentality of a bad War Memorial, and none of the whining of the pacifist who subjects the post-war condition of our country to a melancholy dissection, and then reiterates his tiresome 'I told you so.' You were not allowed to forget the War; yet it seemed as if everything to do with it had been touched by strong, yet gentle and loving, hands and transfigured into a parable for the present generation—something like 'the moral equivalent of war,' of which we hear so often from the pulpit. And as I left Mr. Clayton, a sentence came back to me from the closing chapter in Mr. Chesterton's 'Short History of England': 'When the critic of politics and literature, feeling that this war is after all heroic, looks around him to find the hero, he can point to nothing but a mob.' I felt this of the photographs and letters on the walls of the church, of the Toc H. men whom I met, of the

affections and ideals of the Padre, and of the sheaves of papers he gave me to read. They were all to do with quite ordinary people—' nothing but a mob '—yet a mob no less heroic, perhaps, than the 600 men of the Queen's Westminsters who did not come back . . . for they are engaged in a new experiment in applied Christianity.

This, it seems to me, is the angle from which those who know as little as I do of Toc H. should approach the movement. Would it be too much to say that Mr. Clayton and his men are doing for the youth of the nation what Miss Hetty Lee and others like her have done for our Sunday Schools ? There is no space to develop the analogy here, but it is not so long since the now familiar talk about ' self-expression ' was strange and exciting, and we began to learn that there were certain things children had to do, if they were to be natural and therefore interested in their work—and we discovered that we were trying to make them do exactly the opposite. Something of this kind, I believe, is going on in Toc H. It is not only ' social work ' ; for it may go deeper and spread further than that. It is an attempt to give an opportunity for the young, in a new and more natural way, to develop ' self-expression '—how the Padre would dislike this stilted phrase, but I am trying to feel my way to an understanding of his work—along the old paths of love and service. . . . Of its future it would be rash to prophesy ; time will test its worth. But of its inspiration and the source of its strength to-day, there is, and can be, no shadow of a doubt.

THE RIGHT REVEREND WILLIAM TEMPLE, BISHOP OF MANCHESTER

THERE are three or four teachers in the Church of England who, in the judgment of their pupils, seem, by the range and influence of their teaching, easily to overtop their fellows. Dr. Gore is one; the Bishop of Gloucester is another; and William, Bishop of Manchester, is a third. There is a reason for this, I have thought, apart from their natural endowments; it is that they had the supreme good fortune—granted to them, no doubt, because of those endowments—to be able to spend some years, especially the precious years immediately after the taking of 'schools,' far from the distractions and fascinations of parochial work, in adding one storey after another to the intellectual foundations which they laid as undergraduates. Hence the big mental background, so different from the pigeon-holed facts and ready-made deductions of the mere lecturer, which I am not alone in believing to be one of Dr. Temple's greatest equipments for the office he holds. 'Penialinus' would, I suppose, call his career 'meteoric'; I need not describe it in detail, it is all to be found in 'Crockford.' But I hold in happy remembrance a week-end spent at Repton School sixteen years ago, when I recall the Headmaster's delight at finding a boy lying out on the grass and reading 'The Egoist' on a Sunday afternoon, his enthusiasm at some form of 'house-singing' in the evening, when he took a distinguished and audible part in—I forget; it was probably some Handel chorus about the glory of the Lord being revealed, or it may have been 'Sweet and Low'; I have little memory for concerted items—and I lent to many a boy, until one of them was cunning

enough not to return it, a volume of sermons preached by Dr. Temple in the school chapel.

If every career has a turning-point, Dr. Temple's came when he gave up the Rectory of St. James', Piccadilly, to tour the country on behalf of the Life and Liberty Movement. The results of that tour and of the work which he did on behalf of the movement are written in Church history; and it is well, when tributes are paid to those who helped to secure the passage of the Enabling Bill, that his share in that work should not be forgotten. Public opinion in the Church could never, I believe, have been aroused to the enthusiasm which ultimately carried the Bill through Parliament without some act that struck the Church's imagination; and this it found in Dr. Temple's resignation of St. James', Piccadilly.

But it is as the leader of the largest 'Christian Social' movement which has yet risen in the Churches that the Bishop of Manchester is best known (at least, outside his own diocese) to-day; and my first questions were of Copec. (Is it too much to hope, by the way, that this habit of inventing abbreviations for the names of societies will not spread much further? 'Toc H.' and 'Copec' are bad enough, but surely 'Cactum,' for the Central Advisory Council for the Training of the Ministry, is quite intolerable.)

'The object of the Copec, in a sentence,' answered the bishop, 'is to attempt to apply the principles of the Gospel to the ordering of social and economic life.' The phrase was not unfamiliar. It has always seemed to me to constitute, and is probably intended to constitute, a double challenge—first to those who deny that religion can have anything to do with economics (though I think that the opponents here are neither so numerous nor so strong as they were), and secondly to those who are in favour of 'creating the right atmosphere,' but regret to see the Church interfering in a particular industrial dispute.

I asked the bishop, first, to explain to me the relation, as he sees it, between religion and economics.

'I am in no doubt of my position there,' was the reply. 'Economics is a science based, like any other science, on observation of facts. It generalises from those facts, and its generalisations constitute the laws of political economy. But the facts which it studies are the facts of human behaviour, which is at least to some extent affected by the human will. There are some laws of political economy plainly independent of all religious considerations. You cannot, for instance, distribute what has not been produced; nor can you permanently run any business at a loss. But the laws of this kind are very few, and most economic laws would become quite different if the motives governing human conduct were different. Let me explain. The law of supply and demand rests on the theorem that every man wants to sell dear and buy cheap. That is itself so true of the existing world that the law which follows from it is also broadly true; and the price of commodities is fixed at the point which equalises supply and demand. But all this need not be true at all. A man might wish to receive not the highest price he could get, but what he thought was the right price; and a purchaser might wish to pay this rather than force the price down. I can give you a very simple instance. My own tailor, when the war broke out, had a large stock of cloth which he had bought at pre-war prices; and he continued to sell it at what he thought was a fair profit on the price he had paid—which was, of course, far below the price he could have got. So far, his conscience or far-sightedness, or both, tended to modify the strict form of the law of supply and demand.'

I recalled at this point the title of Mr. R. H. Tawney's book, in which much the same thesis had been developed; and I asked the bishop whether he wanted to kill the 'acquisitive' instinct.

'No. Such a change won't kill it altogether, and

I don't think it ought to be killed. Tawney, I think, exaggerates the evil of it. And the title of his (mostly) excellent book would be more accurate if it ran—The Sickness of an *unmitigatedly* Acquisitive Society.'

'But you think it possible that a Christian conscience, if fully developed, could modify this instinct?'

'Yes; because a situation would arise in which people did not take undue advantage of their opportunities.'

'You have not forgotten,' I said, 'the dictum of one of your brother bishops, that the laws of economics are as fixed as those of physics?'

'No, I have not; but I regard it as highly inaccurate. Physics is a science studying the behaviour of objects that are not under control of the human will. The analogy, therefore, will not hold. And remember,' the bishop added, 'that your economic system has, in itself, a great influence on the growth of character; and one wants its influence to tend in the Christian direction, that is, in the direction of fellowship. So that I can't either say—First get the spirit right and it will correct the system; or, First get the system right and it will give you the right spirit. The truth is that the two must develop side by side, very short steps being taken at a time.'

'Did you happen to notice the views of the Dean of St. Paul's,' I asked, 'as he expressed them in a recent interview with me?'

'I did indeed. He did what is very commonly done: he quoted the words, "Man, who made me to be a judge or a divider over you?" as if it were the whole of our Lord's answer—and this in spite of the fact that in another context he quoted the rest of it. When our Lord was asked to arbitrate in a dispute, He practically said—"I won't settle your dispute, but I will tell you how to avoid having one: take heed and beware of covetousness."'

We passed on to the much more difficult question of the Church's duty in any particular social crisis. Two

obvious examples occurred to me—the first, the pronouncement of the Archbishop on behalf of the Church of England and the Free Churches during the general strike; the second, the action taken by the Industrial Christian Fellowship in the coal dispute. Few can remember, I suppose, any statement made on behalf of the Churches which aroused more diverse judgments in the country than that put out by the Primate, ranging from the insolence of a Conservative M.P. for one of the Manchester divisions, who described the Archbishop of Canterbury as an 'irresponsible person'—another Member of Parliament contrasted, in a letter to me, the 'sickly sentiment' of the Archbishop with the 'noble Christian words' (*sic*) of Cardinal Bourne—to the innumerable ordinary folk who regarded his Grace's utterance as a noteworthy and courageous pronouncement on behalf of Christianity in the cause of peace. I asked the bishop whether, in his opinion, the Primate was not fully justified in his effort.

'I think,' he said, 'that it was admirable, and except for one word, which was open to misunderstanding, exactly right. It began with a clear assertion of Christian principle, that only by good-will and not by the issue of mere conflict could a true peace be reached. Then, carefully marked off as a suggestion and nothing else, followed the three points. I think the word "simultaneously" led some to think that the Archbishop was virtually asking the Government to negotiate with the general strike instead of demanding its unconditional surrender. But, in fact, what he asked the Government was in substance what the Government had already promised. I think the Archbishop's courageous stand for good-will, refusing to treat the strike as any kind of war, was one of the best things that have happened for a generation.'

'And what of the action of the I.C.F.?' I asked. 'Ought such a society to do more than try to help in making a better spirit in industry, or is it justified in

interfering more directly? You remember that Mr. Baldwin indulged in a little gentle irony at the expense of the Church, when he compared the attempt made by the I.C.F. to secure agreement between the parties in the coal industry to an attempt of the F.B.I. to "bring about the reunion of Particular Baptists with Anglo-Catholics." What would be your retort to the Prime Minister?'

'First, I should say what the Bishop of Lichfield did say, that we should all be delighted if the F.B.I. showed intelligent interest in such a question. But, beyond that, the Prime Minister's little joke ignores all claim on the part of the Church to be the minister of reconciliation. Those of us who went to see him did not go as experts who supposed that they had any valuable suggestions of their own to offer. But, as ministers of reconciliation, they had seen first the owners and then the miners, seeking to draw from them something on which an advance could be made. From the miners had come a suggestion which was a very real advance on their previous declarations; so the Church folk concerned at once passed it on to the Government, not for immediate acceptance or rejection, but in the hope of paving the way still further for a settlement by good-will. This again seems to me a thoroughly sound line to follow.'

But it was time to return to Copec, and I asked the bishop whether he could point to any results that had been achieved by the movement.

'I am sure,' he replied, 'that there are many Christian folk furiously thinking about these things who had never dreamed of doing so before. We are going on steadily with our education work, and we are also in touch with the Social Service Sub-Committee of the Joint Committee of the Lambeth Conference and the Free Churches on Reunion, discussing the desirability of forming a Christian Social Council. This might come to have a place, in reference to these questions, analogous to that

of the Conference of British Missionary Societies in reference to overseas work.'

'And what is the goal of Copec? Do you regard it as a permanent society?'

'I should like it to culminate in a joint campaign through the country on the lines of I.C.F., with the full cognisance of the Churches, urging Christians to care more for the social order, and social reformers to realise their need of religious inspiration. I should then like to see it hand over to the Churches to carry on; though you will understand that this is only a personal speculation.'

The 'need of religious inspiration' was a phrase that turned my thoughts at once to the Labour Party and its future; and I asked the bishop to give me his views on the relations between religion and Labour.

'In the Labour Movement,' he said, 'we see a great force which owed its initial impetus very largely to idealism. It has put the notion of fellowship into its political appeal, and so has marked a real moral advance (as I think) on a progressive appeal based on liberty only, though it is sometimes liable to forget that liberty is the indispensable basis of fellowship. On the other hand, we have heard speakers for the Labour Movement commending fellowship in the very spirit of pugnacity; and one is driven to the conclusion that the ideals will come to very little unless a force stronger than mere idealism comes in to keep the followers of those ideals true to them. Moreover, all social reform is in the last resort personal reform, and nearly all the agencies tackling problems of personal character are manned by the Churches, even when not conducted under their name. I will give you an instance that came under my own notice. The Head of the University Settlement in Manchester was inclined to be critical of the inactivity of the Student Christian Movement in practical things; but it turned out, on inquiry, that nearly all his best helpers were members of that movement.'

I had one more question to ask on social problems. Remembering that Dr. Temple was out of England while the Chancellor imposed the betting-tax, my surprise was lessened that he had not raised his voice in protest against it; but I asked him what he thought of it in principle.

'I wish they had not done it,' was the reply. 'I regard betting as wrong in principle, not only in excess; it is the distribution of purchasing power on the basis of chance—and that is intolerable as a principle.'

'Do you make any distinction between betting and gambling? The amount of "chance" that enters into a horse-race—let us say, when one of three horses starts at 6 to 4 on—is clearly less than that of a ball stopping in a particular section of a roulette-board?'

'Yes—but even then it is possible that a dog or a suffragette may run out in front of the favourite! My contention, on the main point, is that there is really no difference in principle. If a man backs his opinion at a shilling, the harm done is, of course, negligible, just as it is if I have one more chocolate cream when I have had enough. But it is wrong, I repeat, in principle; and if that very principle is in fact making havoc of society, I ought to refuse to touch it with a barge-pole.'

Here I found it necessary to remember that Dr. Temple is a diocesan bishop as well as a social reformer, and I talked for a while on the problems of his diocese. I choose one point in particular for quotation, because I have heard the bishop say in the Church Assembly that there are twenty-four parishes in his diocese with populations of over 10,000, each served by only one parson.

'No bishop,' said Dr. Temple, 'can ever have the problem of man-power out of his mind for long. The scarcity of ordination candidates is one of the most pressing problems the Church has to face. They are not coming forward fast enough.'

'When you took part in the university mission at

Cambridge,' I asked, ' did you see any signs of improvement ? '

' Well, I felt at least more hopeful than I have been for a long time ; and several persons very closely in touch with the life of the university told me that they thought the tide had turned.'

' But even if it has,' I interrupted, ' it is quite clear that for many years we cannot hope to get back to the pre-war numbers. Is there not a need of drastic reorganisation of the parochial system ? '

' I think,' the bishop replied, ' that more will have to be done in the way of grouping parishes together ; and we ought to be ready to close churches ruthlessly in areas where the need for them is small.'

' Are you closing many in Manchester ? '

' We have a Commission sitting which, I hope, is going to close about four or five : they have decided to close one already. The present system encourages a wasteful distribution of man-power, and makes men work under conditions which are utterly discouraging. And I have been wondering, since a regular contributor to the *Guardian*, my friend, Canon Peter Green, put it into my head, whether we ought not to do more in imitation of the great Wesleyan Central Halls—to aim, that is, at strong centres with a vigorous life, rather than attempt to hold on to a great number of weak centres that present the appearance of languishing.'

It has always been a puzzle to me, how a single-handed priest in a parish of 10,000 can do much pastoral work, and I asked Dr. Temple whether his clergy were able to make personal contact with new people.

' Visiting,' he replied, ' is very difficult. The parson is overwhelmed with routine work, and in the time left for visiting he can hardly do more than care for those already attached, wholly or partly, to the Church. Visiting, as a way of first making contact, is in these circumstances nearly impossible on any considerable scale, but I am convinced that visiting is the foundation

of all the best parochial work, and the belittling of it among some clergy is quite deplorable.'

'How far,' I asked, 'does this react upon church attendance in your diocese?'

'Considerably. But that raises many questions, such as Sunday observance and the hours at which church services are held. We have to go back to the schools, I believe, if we are to get to the bottom of the lax observance of Sunday. In how many Council Schools, though they *may* teach the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, do the principles of the Fourth Commandment get any real attention? Hence the young see neither the duty nor the gain of going to church, and the habit doesn't start. But I think I can trace in the North a considerable return to church by young men (mostly of the post-war generation) especially at the evening service, though this is to some extent true also of the morning service.'

'Are your people in the North satisfied, do you think, with the present hours at which services are held?'

'Not altogether. I believe there is a growing volume of opinion that eleven o'clock is a bad hour. But we must avoid making *any* hour universal. In many parishes a parish Communion at 9.30 A.M. would be successful, though not in all; and a later morning service might be an instruction with very short prayers, rather on the lines of the University Sermon. But in this, as in many other departments of Church life, all rational experiments should be encouraged.'

At this point Dr. Temple expressed a wish to say a word on Canon Wilson's Essay on Evolution, which was published in the *Guardian*. 'I read it with the greatest interest; and it is particularly valuable as coming from one so universally revered, who has watched the whole career of the Evolution controversy since the very beginning. I want to say that I think it is time to state that Christians have no need to make concessions to

Evolution. Rather they ought to claim it as an ally, which gives a background to Christian doctrine much more akin to it than was provided by the older notions about the universe.'

'You agreed, then, with the main contention of the essay?' I asked.

'Yes; but I think Canon Wilson overdid the distinction between "progressive revelation" and "progressive discovery." This point was well made by one of your correspondents. God gave us our minds with which to think about Him, and only through His act can we know anything of Him at all. But I do believe that there is another divine action over and above the creation of mind, consisting in the illumination of minds which constantly seek and depend upon Him. My father used to say that the difference between Isaiah and Plato is not that Isaiah was inspired and Plato was not, but that Isaiah knew he was inspired and Plato did not.'

Plato suggested philosophy, and I remembered the bishop's career and 'Mens Creatrix,' for which he was awarded his Litt.D. But philosophy is not at all my line of country, and I could only murmur some platitudinous query about 'philosophic restatement.'

It was said of the late Lord Northcliffe, in his early days, that he hit on the secret of popular journalism as soon as he discovered that 'Sir Alfred Harmsworth must never address to the tired clerk any more intelligent remark than the tired clerk could address to Sir Alfred Harmsworth.' Dr. Temple evidently has the same knack, for he did not even mention *τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι*, nor did he put to me any heart-breaking Platonic conundrum of the *κλέπτης ἄρα τις ὁ δίκαιος* type. He just emphasised one single point, which I found not only intelligible but extremely interesting.

'We are not ready for philosophic restatement on such a scale that it could become authoritative for the next few generations. And philosophy cannot march

alone. History and psychology are equally important; they are both indispensable to a complete statement. On the historical side criticism is settling down to certain commonly received results; and we shall soon be nearer to something like a sober and accepted psychology. But I am convinced that there is now really urgent need that individuals and groups should be trying to set out surveys of the whole field, showing how the parts fit together. The theologians should not confine themselves to the further elaboration of particular doctrines taken one by one. That is a process which leads to the detachment from actuality which the late Master of Balliol professed to find in Cambridge Mathematics, as illustrated by the alleged question in a Tripos paper, beginning—"On the point of a highly polished needle rotating at an infinite speed there stands a small elephant whose weight may be neglected." What we need, and what experience shows that people are really interested in, is a comprehensive survey. But it is only when several such attempts have been made that an authoritative statement can be produced.'

At the end of my talk with Dr. Temple, I was left with crowded impressions, but with one in particular which has remained in my mind again and again after listening to him, both in public and private—that in lucidity of exposition he is unrivalled among the teachers and leaders of the Church. I have heard him in the pulpit and on the platform, in the Church Assembly and at other gatherings; I have watched him often in the chair at conferences and committee meetings, when things were getting into a bit of a tangle that needed straightening out; I have discussed with him privately many problems of Church and State. And always there has shone out that luminous clearness of thought and expression which explains, in part at least, the grip in which he holds his listeners. Of his intellectual standpoint I am not qualified to write; but I think that a simple person would be

justified in finding, in the closing sentences above, a clue to his interpretation of the universe. From a mind that is expressive of the subtle advantages derived from the best that life in a university can offer—dare I add that you don't get quite the same thing at Cambridge?—the impression is gained of one who sees life 'steadily' and sees it 'whole,' who can understand and interpret the relations between different types of practical life, and the bearing of one mental or spiritual activity upon another. Ancient and modern are not mere terms of succession, but parts of a living whole. Metaphysics, politics, ethics, art, are not compartments but confluent streams, and they are attracted to a common object, because they rise from a common source—the One God. *Deus Rerum Tenax Vigor.*

THE REV. G. A. STUDDERT-KENNEDY, M.C.

THE object of these interviews is to bring before their readers certain prominent personalities in the Church, with special reference to the particular contribution that they are making to the life and health of Church and State. It is difficult, for instance, to think of Mr. Clayton apart from Toc H., or of the Dean of Canterbury apart from the reunion of Christendom. My object in seeking out Mr. Studdert-Kennedy—who is nearly as elusive in his movements as Mr. Clayton—was to secure an impression of that all too rare clergyman, the Evangelist of the Common Man. Of Mr. Studdert-Kennedy's other gifts, as poet and theologian, many readers will be aware; there are, however, other poets and other theologians. But no evangelist in the Church to-day seems to possess Mr. Studdert-Kennedy's gift of expressing the deepest truths of religion in language 'rich and rare'—sometimes, I believe, the language is considered a little over-rich—which goes straight to the heart of the common man, and stays there to bear fruit. (I stress this last point especially, for many can testify to the wisdom and sanity with which he guides individuals along the path on which he first helped them to set their feet.) I know one man at least who is thankful that Mr. Studdert-Kennedy's style is a little unconventional. A few years ago a friend of mine in Government service in India, whose leave was nearly due, came into his bungalow in a state of nervous irritability and heart-sickness, which is not uncommon among those who overwork themselves in the East. Before he flung himself on his bed, he caught sight of a book which

some visitor had left on the shelf, called 'Food for the Fed-up.' The words suited his mood exactly. Had the book been called 'Water for the Wayfarer' or 'Hints for the Hopeless' he would not have touched it. The title led him to read the book; and the reading of it changed his life.

But it must be explained what is Mr. Studdert-Kennedy's idea of 'the work of an evangelist.' It is, of course, to preach Christ, the same Christ whom St. Paul and Wesley and Arthur Stanton preached—cover, by the way, a portrait of Mr. Studdert-Kennedy except the nose and mouth, and you have more than a suggestion of the face of Savonarola—and yet they would hardly have spoken of Him in the words used by this modern missioner.

'A cosmic Christ,' he said; 'that should be the burden and the content of our gospel to-day. You wonder why there is a lack of preachers in the Churches—for it is as true of every other Church as it is of ours. Ask yourself whether the answer is not that we have no gospel. And we have no gospel because we preach a domestic Christ who ends outside a man's front door. We are just beginning to understand St. Paul; the essence of his teaching is this cosmic Christ. Everything is to be interpreted in terms of Him. You can no more go beyond the Incarnation than you can do without it. We have got to go back to Him and away with Him—away into all the world, and, through Him, interpreting all the world. We think too much of ourselves, our own views, our own spiritual experiences. We preach Communion as if it were a personal matter, instead of a holy gathering of His people, out on a last wild hope to redeem the world. If that is what we are out for, we can snap our fingers at the Devil, for he will have about as much chance of upsetting the Church as a kitten has of bringing St. Paul's Cathedral down in ruins by rubbing its back against one of the pillars.'

Only those who have heard Mr. Studdert-Kennedy on a platform or in the pulpit will understand how his words are poured out in a torrent that could come from the lips of none but an Irishman, and that sentences like the above—delivered as he paced up and down a room in the Fellowship House at Westminster—represent the style with which he captures and holds his audience.

'You see what I mean,' he went on, 'by interpreting everything in terms of Christ. What we have to do is to persuade people that religion has something to do with life to-day. They can see God in the trees and the rivers—as all but the blind can—but they cannot see Him in petrol and machinery; and the Church has not taught that God has any interests in the developments of the modern world. Can you think of a single book, written before the war, in which these new developments are linked up with the Christian religion?'

'What about Henry Scott Holland?' I asked.

'Perhaps,' was the reply. 'But he stands alone, and even he did not develop the great unification of the world.'

And here Mr. Studdert-Kennedy laid his hand flat on the table and, gradually raising the palm, drew the tips of the fingers together on the table and said—'That is what God is doing. He is closing up the world, and if you are going to fight one another in these circumstances God's world will peter out. He is doing all this, whether you like it or not. Economic determinism is a powerful influence, but to suppose that it determines the world's destiny is wrong. God is behind it all. He is making the world one, and with our narrow conceptions we are trying to keep it in passionately separate units. Isn't this true of Europe? He made Europe one, He is making it more so every day, and we go on trying to split it up into separate entities. That is why, if you want to travel 3000 miles in Europe, it takes a fortnight to get a passport, but you can take a ticket from New York to San Francisco in two minutes. It is barriers,

barriers, all the time that we are erecting. . . . I hope I am not wandering from the point?'

'A little, perhaps,' I replied. 'I am beginning to feel rather like a public meeting. Let me take you back to where we started. You say that one reason why the Church does not appeal to the ordinary man is that she is only preaching half the gospel. When questions are asked at your meetings, what other criticisms of the Church do you find? Do any of the old objections still survive?'

'Such as——?'

'The Establishment.'

'Not a bit. People are not thinking along those lines at all to-day.'

'Or the difficulties of our Prayer-book services?'

'A little. But you won't get people to church merely by altering your Prayer-book. I don't mean that such alteration is necessarily bad; it is good, provided you don't break the tradition and the atmosphere. We are doing a good thing if we make our Church services more intelligible. But the tradition must be kept, because people want it.'

'Do you find that the Church is regarded as the Church of the rich, and as out of touch with the ideals of Labour?'

'Sometimes. But here again the issue is a very narrow one. Simply to preach socialism is no earthly good. You won't fill your churches that way. Socialism is no more Christian than capitalism; apart from a higher level of social power, which can only be got through Divine grace, Socialism is a dream, and a bad dream at that. Those who have once believed in this gospel are now disillusioned. What we want is a sense of God's purpose and presence in the world, such as I was speaking of just now.

'But let me tell you,' Mr. Studdert-Kennedy continued, 'what is really wanted: more personality and more fellowship. Personality dominates all the time; and

nothing but the creation of a more Christian brotherhood in the Church, with a wide vision of the Kingdom of God, where men love our Lord and one another, will ever fill our churches. Where we get that, the churches are full. It is exactly to-day as in primitive days. The Church is made up of the churches. In these there are living cells, and dead cells. You can have a living body and dead cells—you have them now, in the Church of England. Everything ultimately depends on the vitality of each cell in the body. Think, in relation to this point, of absolution. Effective absolution may depend on the life in the cells which make up the body. It may, at any time, be valid perhaps, but not effective unless the whole body is living. It may give freedom from guilt, but not power to renounce. But this is by the way. . . .'

'I have two more questions to ask,' I broke in, 'on this point. Do you think that we talk too much about the "failure" of the Church, or that it is likely that men will join a society which is always being criticised by its own members?'

'Well, at any rate, that is a merciful over-doing. Willingness to confess sins is a distinctively Christian thing, and you can't very well have too much of it. And we seem to have a perfect obsession about what people are *thinking* of the Church. What does it matter what they think so long as we are doing our job? A Church that is always confessing its sins may be a "wash-out" to some people, but if it keeps on doing that, it shows that it has the root of the matter in it. We may confess that the Body of Christ is being crucified by us, but, thank God, it still remains the Body of Christ. And if you were to ask me what are the two human things that have helped to keep the Church alive in the last ten years, I should say, first, a willingness to confess its sins, and, second, a growing hatred of injustice and wrong.'

'My other question is about our theology—our conception of the character of God.'

'Yes, there we need more careful and intelligent

teaching. But I will only mention one point. Most of our teachers, when they speak of evil or disease, confuse God and the Devil. These things would be more easily understood if we taught the mercy of God and the mercilessness of evil. God sends life. He is pure undiluted love. He is against evil. Evil is remorseless and merciless, and there is no bending in it. So, when we talk of the " anger " or the " severity " of God, the severity is there right enough ; but it is not God's, it is the Devil's. If we interpret these words conceptually, on a line with human ideas, we do God wrong. They express the everlasting opposition between God and the Devil. The awful danger of falling away from God is that of being caught up in the wheel of the ages which we call Hell.'

It was time to pass on to the work of the Society of which Mr. Studdert-Kennedy is the chief messenger, and the Industrial Christian Fellowship was very much in the public eye just then.

' Let me begin,' Mr. Studdert-Kennedy said, ' by telling you the great danger of a movement like ours. I am sure I am as much alive to it as anybody. It is that a purely material movement for more comfort may want to collar Christ and use Him for its own ends. This we must never permit. That is why I try to bring the appeal home to the individual every time ; I am never tired of repeating that what the movement requires is good men with a sense of the over-lordship of God and reverence for Him, who don't blame their neighbours but themselves. Men are moved more than ever to-day by the herd instinct and the herd passion. And these are irrational and dangerous. Most of them can only see in economic questions the part which touches their own pocket. It is largely on these lines that they reason, and their reasons are not worth twopence. If I say to an audience—" I hear that enormous quantities of coal are being transferred by owners to subsidiary undertakings

at purely nominal prices, and that the owners gain on the subsidy undertakings what they lose on the mines, and then they lower wages"—my remark is greeted with cheers. And then I ask the audience to produce evidence for such a charge; and their evidence is nil. Crowds are irrational. The danger of democracy is that men are swayed merely by their feelings. What we have got to do is to sublimate these feelings, and make men be moved not by them but by a passion for the Kingdom of God. That is what is meant by the usual phrases about a Christian outlook on industrial and economic problems.'

'Do you see signs,' I asked, 'of the growth of that outlook?'

'Every day; and more signs every day,' was the reply. 'Such movements as the I.C.F. have made an enormous difference in the last five years. All sorts of people are now interested in the Christian outlook on the modern world. The idea is dawning that this world of great machines and capital accumulations has something to do with God—that, as I said just now, He has a purpose in it.'

'You still find, I suppose, considerable differences of opinion on the question whether organised religion ought to use its influence in political affairs?'

'Yes; and there will be, until men realise that every political question contains an element of passion. University professors who talk of certain questions as "purely economic" or "purely political" say that religion has no business in industrial affairs. That is cant. Scientific questions are abstract; but there are others in which passion is aroused. You and I would discuss the differential calculus and not lose our tempers, because neither of us cares a hang about it. But in social questions we are asked to discuss human relationships, the relation, let us say, of our own children to the children of others.'

'Will you tell me,' I went on, 'what is the opinion of

the I.C.F. among the Communists and the Labour Party ? '

' The Communists,' Mr. Studdert-Kennedy replied, ' are against us, because communism is a religious faith, and a different faith from ours. Communism is one of the most vigorous religions in Europe. It varies with the weather. It feeds on misery, and, in times of upset and places where there is overcrowding and want, it has its chance.'

' Do you think its influence is growing ? '

' In certain places. It is strongest in Scotland, Wales, Manchester, and a little bit of London ; but its influence is negligible in England, except on a few members of the Labour Party, by whom the Communists are regarded, in spite of their extreme creed, as good Labour and " class-conscious " men, just as the Romanisers in the Church are regarded by the rest of the Anglo-Catholic party as " good Catholics." But outside the Celtic fringe there is little of it in England.'

' Is the right wing of Labour more sympathetic ? '

' Yes. Many Labour men of prominence always sign our Industrial Sunday Appeal, and the growth in the keeping of Industrial Sunday is most remarkable. Part of the strength of the I.C.F. is that the Labour Party does not take us seriously as politicians, but they have a sneaking notion that we are telling the truth, and therein lies the strength of our movement. On the whole it has been faithful to that ideal.'

' Do not some people object to the I.C.F. because of the number of large firms who subscribe to your funds ? '

' A few, perhaps, but we set them off against the curses of the extreme Socialists. They cancel each other. This is perhaps an unromantic position, but it pulls people back to reason all the time. The danger which we want to avoid is that of becoming extreme.'

My talk with Mr. Studdert-Kennedy could only end in one way ; and I asked him whether he thought that

the Standing Conference of Christian Churches was justified in intervening in the coal dispute.

'Not only justified in intervening,' was the reply, 'but it was its bounden duty to do so in the Christian task of reconciliation and peace. A deadlock had been reached; bitterness was increasing, and no one seemed to be taking any steps to bring the parties together. But remember that the Standing Conference did not put forward any terms of its own—it merely pressed upon both parties the desirability of a return to the Report of the Royal Commission, as a document prepared by men of independent judgment, great ability and unquestioned integrity.'

'Could you state quite shortly,' I asked, 'the object of the intervention?'

'The object was to end the deadlock, and find a way to a real and lasting peace; the Standing Conference was of the opinion that such would not evolve if the dispute were to continue on all sides in the spirit of a "fight to a finish." It realised, moreover, that the longer it continued, the worse would be the suffering for the community; and that if the miners were brought to their marrow-bones, and starved to accept any terms the owners decided to make, they would only return to work embittered, which would lead to further trouble later. In short, the Standing Conference felt a responsibility for trying to secure that the settlement should be not only economically sound in itself, but reached with a minimum of bitterness or resentment and a maximum of good-will.'

'You would not agree, probably, that the intervention did more harm than good?'

'The Standing Conference is probably not worrying very much about the result of its efforts; those responsible made an act of witness at a difficult time, believing that they were led by the Holy Spirit. The result is also in His hands; but, as I travel up and down the country and listen to the judgment of fair-minded people, I cannot believe that it was entirely in vain.

At the same time the outlook is extremely dark; and at the moment one sees no signs of the dawn of a peace, such as we have been praying and working for. While thanking God for the witness, therefore, we continue to pray for peace, and for a public opinion which will make it possible.'

I began by describing Mr. Studdert-Kennedy as the Evangelist of the Common Man; and the reason why he can understand, and interpret God to, him is found, I think, in a sentence in one of his best books, 'The Hardest Part': 'Look at the average man with the eyes of love, and you can see God. . . . In the saint and in the average man you can see God in an agony of creative effort, God crucified, but conquering, Christ.' This is the thread that runs through all Mr. Studdert-Kennedy's theology—a theology, as the Dean of Worcester wrote in an introduction to the book referred to, 'hammered out on the field of battle.' He can never forget the war, and the men who died in it, with their enduring summons to the Church—the Church on which his hopes are set. Here is the expression of his resolve: 'Good-bye, Corporal. I'll write to Mother for you. Thank you for dying for me, and teaching me so much. I will try to carry it out. The Church will, too. She is learning from the men that die. She will be more simple in the future. Christ is greater than the Church, and He can use her still, and through her revival He can save the world.'

That was written more than ten years ago; and it is still the faith of Mr. Studdert-Kennedy.

THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY

Few men are better served with spiritual ancestors than the Dean of Canterbury. From the walls of more than one room in the Deanery there look down on him the pictures of his predecessors since the Reformation. The gallery is complete; and a motley collection it is. You can almost tell the period of every dean from his face. Here is the head of a scholar, here of an administrator, and there the face of a saint; and some of those who held office in the darker days remind one of the picture of the 'bloated prelate' in Christ Church Hall, of which Liddon remarked, as he walked up to High Table one evening—'Strange, my friend, that in the providence of Almighty God *that* should have been chosen to connect Mr. Keble with the Apostles.' Three of them specially attracted me: not the three Romneys—of which, I confess, I think the artist cannot have been very proud—but Bagehot, Bishop of Oxford (resplendent over the dining-room mantelpiece, in his Garter robes), who was a friend of Newman's, and has the distinction of being pilloried as a super-pluralist in the recent Report on the Property and Revenues of the Church: Tillotson, the only Archbishop of Canterbury, I imagine, who began his ministry 'with neither oath nor subscription'; of whom it is on record that he 'taught more ministers to preach well, and more people to live well, than any other man since the Apostles' days,' yet whose father's verdict, after hearing one of his sermons (and there have been other fathers like him), was, 'I profess he has done much more harm than good': and, third, Nicholas Wotton, the first dean on the new foundation, who is reported—with

how much truth I do not know—to have been offered the see of Canterbury before it was accepted by Parker. There may be something in the story, for when Wotton was offered a bishopric by the King in 1539, he replied to the 'Rt. Worshipful Mr. Bellassis' as follows: 'Gentyle Mr. Bellassis, yf hit be possible yet, assaye, as far as yow maye, to conveye this bishopricke from me. So I might avoyde hit without displeasure, I wolde surelye never meddel withe hit. I cannot mervile ynough *cur obtrudatur non cupienti, imo ne idoneo quidem.* My mynde is as troubled as my wrytinge is. . . .' This *Nolo episcopari* plaint is found even in the subscription, which runs: 'Yours to his littel powre, Nicholas Wotton. Add whatsoever you will more to hit, so yow add not Bishop.' . . . And, as though to complete the atmosphere, we ate mulberries at luncheon plucked from a tree in the Deanery garden which was growing in the days of James I.

I must confess at the outset that my interview with the Dean did not work out exactly as I had intended. I had prepared, as is my habit, certain questions that seemed to me important and—quite deliberately, I think—the Dean led me away from them, at least at the beginning of our talk. Had we been in a conference, he would have been described as 'raising the debate to a higher level.' His mind was moving on the heights, and it was thither that I had to follow him.

'You should know,' he began, 'that I may have a different idea of Church unity from that which appears to be in the minds of many Christians. By unity I do not mean a central and absolute form of Church government of the Roman kind: this, I think, is neither practicable nor desirable. And I would go on to say—in answer to your first question whether the conclusions of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 mark any real advance towards unity—that it would be more profitable if people would fix their minds on "qualitative" rather than

"quantitative" results; on the growth of a certain spirit rather than on practical achievements already won.'

'And that spirit,' I asked, 'was generated at the Lambeth Conference?'

'It was certainly developed and extended there,' was the reply. 'I doubt whether anything could have given a greater impetus to the movement for Church unity than the spirit which animated the Appeal to All Christian People. There you saw the Church of England humbling itself in shame and confession, admitting the guilt of disunion and its share in the responsibility for it, and expressing a desire for a new comradeship, in which the Churches should come together not to negotiate a particular programme, but to see what measure of agreement could be reached. And one of the first steps towards agreement lies in a fuller recognition by the Churches of one another than hitherto, and in the growing conviction that every section of the Catholic Church has a life of its own, and a claim on the consideration and sympathy of the others. I ask you and your readers to recognise that this in itself is something new, and that this is the habit of mind, the spirit, which has yet to extend in ever-widening circles.'

'Do you think that this habit of mind is spreading in other Churches also?'

'Certainly, I do,' the Dean replied. 'I could give you instances from East and West alike, if you would care to hear them.'

I asked the Dean to expand this a little, and he spoke first of the significance of the Life and Work Conference at Stockholm; the effect of this conference on the religious thought of Europe, and on the development of friendly feelings between countries and Churches, he thought, was very marked, and had inaugurated a new habit of mind in several Churches on the Continent. He reminded me, too, of the growth of the desire for unity in every country after the war, and the disappoint-

ment felt in some circles in Germany that a federation of all the Churches had not been immediately established at Stockholm; of the German Federation of Churches, formed more than six years ago, and of the new and flourishing Czech Church of 'The Brethren,' which was ready to take any opportunities of co-operating with other Churches; and he mentioned an invitation that he had sent to six German and six English theologians of the younger generation to meet at Canterbury.

The Dean then spoke of the influence of Archbishop Söderblom and Dr. Heiler, and of the desire for an 'Evangelical Catholicity' which was the fruit as well as the burden of their teaching.

'Side by side with that,' he continued, 'you have the equally significant but less known attitude of the East. The service at Westminster Abbey on the Nicæan anniversary made a notable impression far beyond the borders of England; and could any sentences breathe more fully the spirit of the Lambeth Conference than these words of Professor Glubokovsky? "The unity that our Saviour loves and ordains cannot be brought about by means of mutual propaganda and conquest. It must be sought in the heights or in the depths of the communion's spiritual being." He took the image from his native country. A Russian house may be divided into several rooms by low walls. Up above there are no dividing walls; down below the people live in separate rooms. Is unity to be gained by thrusting the walls aside so that those who live in the other rooms must either be crushed to death, or leave their dwellings and enter the one that is taking possession of more and more of the floor space? Or must they be crowded and quarrel about the space? Glubokovsky indicated another way out of the difficulty. "Let the walls remain. Each individual thrives best in his spiritual home. One may, of course, appreciate another's home and still remain and thrive best in one's own. The demand that is made

of us is greater and more difficult than to increase a little or much at the expense of others. That which takes place to the detriment of our brethren is no real gain. Nations that live on conquests are still at a low stage of political and social culture. So is the communion which uses every means to strive for power and external conquests. Do not move the walls. But let us all grow in faith, hope and love, so that we reach above the divisions, and see and show our membership of the same Church and congregation of Christ."

'And if,' the Dean added, 'you are looking for an expression of that spirit nearer home, I can give you no better instance of it than the words of a noted Presbyterian, Dr. Alexander Whyte—" When we have humbled ourselves to admit that some other Churches have things of no small moment to teach us and to share with us, and things it will greatly enrich us to receive and to assimilate; when we are of a Christian mind enough to admit, and even to welcome, thoughts and views and feelings like these—then the day of a reconstructed Christendom will have begun to dawn, at least for ourselves." '

We passed naturally to discuss several practical schemes for reunion that had been suggested, and it was to be expected that the outlined plan for Church Union in South India which the Bishop of Bombay had recently made public in England should take a prominent place in our talk.

'I wish it were always remembered,' the Dean said, 'that the problems of reunion in the Mission Field and at home are not governed by exactly the same conditions. I need not elaborate that—the Bishop of Bombay has already explained it clearly and fully. But there is, obviously, all the difference between schemes adopted by such a body as the Lambeth Conference, which expresses the official mind of the Church of England, and those that are proposed, I had almost said as emergency

schemes, in the Mission Field. Whatever may be the merits of what is generally known as the Frere-Garvie scheme, it forms part of a report; it is academic, in the sense that it has never yet been tested as between negotiators. But those who are associated with the Bishop of Bombay—and do not forget the tradition of strong churchmanship which you would connect with Dr. Palmer's name—having considered exhaustively one set of proposals after another, have reached these conclusions as the best way of dealing with a particular situation which demands urgent and sympathetic handling. Their difficulties are greater than ours; they have, for instance, to consider—in relation to the ministry in the United Church—the laying of hands on ministers who come, let us say, from Scotland having already received Presbyterian Orders, and who will have missed the spiritual experiences through which the bishop and his associates have been led to the proposals they suggest. I do not suppose it is any secret that the late Bishop of Zanzibar had many talks with the Bishop of Dornakal on the South India proposals at the time of the Lambeth Conference; and though he would not have seen their present form, he put great faith in the Bishop of Dornakal (as well as his friends) and said that if he (Dornakal) were one of the bishops of the United Church, he would go very far with it. It was a great point that the future was secured, and that the whole scheme was super-national and super-sectional.'

'You have, then, no fear of its reaction on the Church at home?' I asked.

'Why should I? Is there not ample safeguard in one of the resolutions passed by the Provincial Council—"that in the opinion of the Council it is much to be desired that when the formal statement of cardinal points on which a scheme of union should be based has been completed by the Joint Committee, the Metropolitan should ask the Central Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference whether, in their opinion, the Churches of

the Anglican Communion will maintain communion with a Church organised on such principles " ? '

I passed on to those questions of practical difficulty which centre in the Creeds and the ministry, and to the policy to be followed in interchange of pulpits and intercommunion.

' On the first point,' the Dean said, ' I do not see any great doctrinal difficulties. It is impossible to read the Report of the Joint Conference between representatives of the Free Churches and our own Church " On the Nature of the Church," without realising that we have taken considerable steps in advance, and that the points on which we agree are immeasurably more important than those on which we differ. And is not this the experience of the many valuable conferences between Anglicans and Free Churchmen that are taking place up and down the country—that when they get together they discover that, in matters on which they thought they differed fundamentally, there is often extraordinary agreement ? '

' Would you say that this is true of the different conceptions of the ministry ? '

' Not altogether ; but then I regard the question of the ministry as a subordinate one ; and I would add that, in my judgment, there is a grave danger of this issue assuming too large a proportion in the minds of many who are thinking about the problem of reunion. There are other points of far greater importance. The minister, surely, is the organ of the Church. If we gain a right conception of the Church, the question of the ministry will fall into its proper place. The Church is a living body, and therefore capable of adaptation. It has a right to prescribe, to determine, its ministry. I would dare go so far as to say that if—which is singularly improbable—the United Church decided that episcopacy was undesirable, it has a perfect right to change that method of Church government ; but episcopacy is the regulative

ministry ordained in the New Testament and proved by years of history and experience.'

'And what of those very thorny subjects of interchange of pulpits and inter-communion?'

'Let me, on the first of these points, take you back to the Lambeth Report. Here you have this very clear statement: "A bishop is justified in giving occasional authorisation to ministers, not episcopally ordained, who, in his judgment, are working towards an ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal, to preach in churches within his diocese, and to clergy of the diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers." It was in that spirit that I asked Dr. Jones, a well-known Congregationalist minister at Bournemouth, who was also Moderator of the Federal Council of the Free Churches, to preach in the pulpit of Canterbury Cathedral.'

'Did you receive much criticism over that sermon?' I asked.

'Practically none. I received only one letter that I remember; and I believe that, in this matter at least, prejudice is slowly being conquered.'

'But that was a special occasion?' I suggested.

'No—an ordinary Sunday evening service: but we must go further, if we are to carry out the spirit of the Lambeth Report. I should like to see Nonconformist ministers in our pulpits, not frequently of course, but on occasions, in the *ordinary* course of Sunday preaching. Do not forget, I repeat, that the bishops have already accepted this, provided that the minister invited to preach is "working towards an ideal of union such as is described in" the Lambeth Appeal.'

'And what of inter-communion?'

'I take you back again,' replied the Dean, 'to Glubokovsky's words—"Let the walls remain." Each denomination, while recognising that the others are Christian communions, must have its own rules about inter-communion. It is not too much to say that inter-communion *is* union; and, if once it becomes normal,

we shall have achieved a unity which is on one side sufficiently complete. But I am doubtful whether it would help much at present. It is important, however, to mark the difference between inviting members of other communions, and not raising objection when they come ; and a union which does not permit of inter-communion under certain regulations amounts to very little.'

'I suppose we should agree,' I then asked, 'that there has been a movement on the side of Nonconformists in the direction of the idea of one Catholic Church ; but have you noticed any growth of the practical embodiment of that idea (let me say) in liturgy and sacramental worship ?'

'I am quite clear,' was the reply, 'that in Dr. Carnegie Simpson, Dr. Garvie, Dr. Jones and others, you have Free Church leaders who are really Catholic-minded. They have a great belief in the historicity and the universality of the one great Church, split up though it be in small divisions. They are in protest against the limited, parochial, and denominational view of the Church, and anything less than a Catholic Church—an exclusively National Church, for instance—does not satisfy them : they, like ourselves, have learned this lesson from the experiences of the last twenty years. And as to what you ask about a liturgy and sacraments, some leaders in the Free Churches (the Presbyterians, for instance) have sacramental views as high as our own. The Wesleyans—who are nearest to us by history and sentiment, and whose reply to the Lambeth Appeal was the first and, from our point of view, the most welcoming —have had, as you know, a liturgy for some time past, and there is a noticeable advance among Free Churchmen in the desire for a liturgy, which you can trace in Dr. Orchard's "Divine Service," and in the form of worship used in some Congregational churches, which was put out by the Congregational Union.'

We had hardly mentioned, so far, the Church of Rome ;

and I asked the Dean whether he thought the Malines Conversations had been justified.

'I do not see,' he replied, 'that it was possible, after the issue of the Lambeth Appeal, to act otherwise than the Archbishop of Canterbury acted. When once that appeal was launched, it was inevitable that, if a door opened, we should go through it; no Church that had committed itself to the extent that ours had could possibly refuse to take part in such conversations.'

'Do you think,' I asked, 'that Cardinal Mercier's death will make any difference to their progress?'

'I am afraid that it is bound to make some difference. The Cardinal's presidency of the conversations was masterly, and there was also his world-wide reputation and the tremendous moral authority behind his name. He was a papist to the core, yet he had a great vision of a united Church, and he was above all an evangelist. Nothing distressed him more, after the war, than what he called the "de-christianisation of the masses," the widespread failing of faith in the supernatural—and he longed with all his heart to spread the Gospel. The conversations may have reached—I hardly like to call it an end—I mean, roughly, the same kind of halt to which we have come in our negotiations with the Free Churches.'

I had one more question to ask. I wanted, somehow, to translate all that I had heard in the Dean's study that morning—and I have only been able to record a fraction of it here—into terms which could be understood and acted upon by churchmen and Nonconformists everywhere: in the churches of West London, the slums, the market town and the colliery village; in the large central halls of Nonconformist worship and among 'the Saints in Lantern Yard'; for if ever there was a burning question on which the leaders of the Churches were far ahead of the rank and file, it is that of Christian reunion. I held up my copy of 'Documents on Christian Unity,'

and asked the Dean whether he thought it possible for ordinary people to approach the subject through this book, or through any abstract of it that might be made for purposes of study circles and similar gatherings.

The Dean shook his head. 'Not on any large scale,' he replied. 'The documents in themselves would not be very helpful to ordinary churchpeople or Nonconformists; they would find them tedious to a degree.'

'Is anything achieved, do you think, by local and sectional meetings of Anglicans and Free Churchmen?'

'Certainly I do. The more we can get together, the greater the chances of ultimate unity. But there is a much greater depth which we have yet to plumb. In the Churches to-day, we are all too obsessed with the material side of religion—with legislation and machinery, with finance and administration, and with the daily round of parochial life—all of them essential, but do they go deep enough? I wonder whether you heard of a layman's suggestion made a few years ago, that a great need of the Church is to found a Guild of the Holy Spirit in every parish (at least of sufficient size), the object of which would be to study the theology of the Holy Spirit, and of the Church—and, above all, of prayer—in inter-denominational groups. Theology is as important to-day as ever: here, in Canterbury, I know the debt that is owed to Dr. Arthur Robinson, who has theological classes both for Free Church ministers and Anglican clergy. If we knew more about prayer, we should pray more and pray better; and a Guild of the Holy Spirit, to which members of all denominations would belong, might recover the spirit of thoughtful prayer without which no religious revival, and no lasting unity, can come. I would like to end our talk there—so that my last word shall be of this quite tremendous need.'

And so shall mine.

THE REV. H. R. L. SHEPPARD

It is many years since a young layman accepted the post of private secretary to Cosmo Gordon, Bishop of Stepney—on the one condition that no attempt was made to persuade him to be ordained. A year or two later he went as a resident to the Oxford House in Bethnal Green—on the same condition. Both agreements were, I am sure, honourably kept; yet it was not long before the young layman found himself training for the ministry at Cuddesdon. There were legends, a few years afterwards at the Oxford House, of letters and telegrams from the more rarefied atmosphere of Wheatley, threatening an immediate return to Bethnal Green; but as an Oxford House man of many years' residence used to declare that no Head of the House—and he had known five—could ever tell a story without adding something to it, I dare not be more explicit. The return to Bethnal Green did come, but by then Mr. Sheppard was in Orders; his year as Chaplain was followed by a memorable but all too short time as Head; and, although it is nearly seventeen years since he left East London, I would guarantee that you could not walk far with him down the Bethnal Green road to-day without seeing some face light up at the sight of him and some hand grasp his. . . . But his Oxford House days have long gone by; and the subject of my interview is a curate at St. Martin-in-the-Fields—one of the greatest moral and spiritual forces that have moved London since the days of George Howard Wilkinson at St. Peter's, Eaton Square.

There are many congregations in England, thank God, who would declare that their own Church life could

hardly be happier. Nowhere, perhaps, is this said with greater assurance than at St. Martin's, and I began by asking Mr. Sheppard to what he attributed the happiness that radiates from his church.

'I have kept two aims in view since my ministry began —to make the daily Eucharist the power-house which generates the prayers and worship of the congregation; and to create in the church the kind of atmosphere that will make strangers feel at home, and show them a practical exposition of fellowship in every part of our church life. I don't mean giving them an aggressively hearty welcome, or grasping their hands when the last thing they want to do is to shake hands, but just showing a natural pleasure in seeing them, which can be done even more by laity like the sidesmen than by any of the clerical staff, and which spreads an atmosphere that makes people want to come again. Nobody could have had,' Mr. Sheppard went on, 'a more wonderful opportunity than I have had. I was sent to a church which was practically empty, standing on the finest site in the world. Thousands of people of all kinds pass St. Martin's every hour; I knew that if we made the church look hospitable and homely, many would come in, and that if they found courtesy and fellowship there, they would come again. But most important in the creation of atmosphere is the daily Eucharist, and the prayers that are offered all day both by members of the congregation and casual passers-by.'

'You have found, then,' I asked, 'that people will come in large numbers to say their prayers in a church, even though the Blessed Sacrament is not reserved?'

'Certainly. I can understand the help that the presence of the Sacrament affords to certain people, but St. Martin's is not the only church which proves that Reservation is not essential for thousands who wish to snatch a few moments of prayer and meditation in a church.'

Of the manifold activities of St. Martin's it was impossible to talk at any length. But I believe it is true

that the St. Martin's Guild of Fellowship was the first organisation of its kind in the country, and, as similar guilds have been started in other large parishes, I asked Mr. Sheppard to tell me something of it.

'At the bottom of it,' he said, 'lies the great principle of service. Our chief rules of membership are that everybody who joins is pledged to consider such opportunities of service as may be put before him or her, and each one of our fourteen hundred members has made that promise. The work that they do may be in the parish or outside it; but I must not weary you or your readers with a long list of the Guild's activities. It differs from many parochial organisations of a more usual kind because we make no inquiries as to a candidate's religious convictions.'

'The Guild is not confined, then, to communicants?'

'No, because I feel that it is impossible to make any distinction between the "sheep" and the "goats." We have found again and again that if unconfirmed persons find happiness and fellowship within the Guild, it is not long before they are confirmed; and it seems to be not only unlike our Lord's methods to impose a test, but also to show distrust in His power, if we make such distinctions. We just take members on their reverent declaration that they wish to serve God. There are many strong "Catholic" and "Protestant" centres in which men and women with those convictions can feel at home; but St. Martin's stands for a diffused rather than a sectional Christianity.'

'Would you, then, communicate Nonconformists?' I asked.

'Yes,' was the reply, 'if it were not in answer to a challenge, or to make a demonstration. I do not think our Lord would have turned away any reverent soul from the altar, who could say—"Lord, I believe: help Thou mine unbelief."

'And here I should like to say a word,' Mr. Sheppard continued, 'about the musical recitals we have at

St. Martin's. We do not have, as some have supposed, women wrapped in furs singing in front of the altar, nor is there any fussing about or irreverence. Nor do we pretend that it is half a Church service, with prayers and hymns introduced at inappropriate moments. It is a musical performance and nothing else ; where possible, performers are hidden, and nothing is allowed to take away from the reverence and dignity of the church. We have an average attendance of nearly a thousand, and I should like to see many other central churches used for similar purposes. You remember the man who always used to take his hat off as he passed the Excelsior Hall in Bethnal Green ? Well, that is what I should like to see men doing as they pass our parish churches day by day.'

But there is one respect in which St. Martin's is unique, for on one Sunday in the month it has probably the largest congregation in the world ; and I asked Mr. Sheppard whether he ever regretted having arranged a broadcast service on the second Sunday in every month.

' Never for a single moment since it started,' was the reply. ' We had, of course, certain criticisms to answer when we began, but these have now almost entirely ceased. I admit that we took the plunge with great trepidation, but it seemed just one of those things—on the principle of " all things are yours "—that the Church should claim and use to the utmost.'

' Do you think there is anything,' I asked, ' in the complaint that it keeps people away from church on Sunday evening ? '

' Very little, I should say : and on that point there are two words to be added. First, I should regard it as definitely ill-advised for a broadcast service to be anything in the nature of a competitor with the ordinary Church services ; that is the reason why it is always held after the usual church hours. And secondly, the few lazy people whom it may keep away from church are

really not much spiritual loss to any congregation. I wonder, too, how far it is realised that the Gospel is brought into the homes of millions who otherwise would not hear it, and that it is an unmixed blessing to thousands who are bed-ridden or invalids, and to whom the sound of the public prayers and the hymns that they remember and love are looked forward to with joy from week to week. But what matters most is the preparation of the congregation. At St. Martin's we try to prepare ourselves by prayer for God's blessing on the service, and I am sure that the atmosphere in the church on the night can be somehow transmitted over the wireless. The sermon is the least important part, and in the thousands of letters I have received there have been more references to the simple prayers and hymns than to the sermon that is preached. It is curious, also, how many correspondents—especially those who are on the high seas—mention the bells of St. Martin's, which bring back to them the days of their youthful idealism.'

It would be wrong to imagine that Mr. Sheppard's work at St. Martin's prevents him from taking an interest in the wider problems of the Church and Nation; there is probably no priest in the Church of England who touches life at so many points. So we spoke next of the rising generation—the greatest of all problems for the Church to-day—and I asked Mr. Sheppard what hope he had of a religious revival among the young.

'I find it extraordinarily hard,' he replied, 'to understand exactly the condition of mind and heart of the young people: it almost defies analysis. Roughly, I should say that there has never been a time at which there was more idealism and less achievement, or more people ready to applaud an expression of the highest sentiments and fewer willing to give a hand in putting them into practice. In this women appear to me to be far in advance of men.'

I mentioned the remarkable service held in the Albert

Hall on Armistice Day, 1925, and the amazing response which was made to the appeal to keep the day as one of sacred memory, rather than of shallow pleasure.

'That is exactly what I mean,' he replied. 'There you had a day on which the best feelings of everybody were uppermost, and there was a splendid opportunity of taking advantage of it. It was certainly not mere superstition that led those thousands to the Albert Hall. And I am worried more than I can say by the hunger for idealism that is felt by so many, who yet know nothing, and seem to care so little, about God. It is partly our fault, and partly the muddle-headedness of those whom we are trying to reach. We have not really been faithful in teaching about the God Whom our Lord revealed and of Whom He taught, and we must not be surprised if ordinary folk know little of the Father-God of Jesus. The God of the Old Testament seems to be the only God they know anything about, and they can't find—even if they try—any connecting link between Him and the thoughts and hopes which move them in their better moments. They like to feel that they belong to a country like England in which there is still some idealism left, but it all has very little to do with religion.'

We talked much of the younger generation, and the question arose whether there was not a social danger in the widespread desire for mere pleasure and enjoyment.

'There is no doubt,' he said, 'that the young are more given to pleasure than when you and I were boys; but, honestly, I am not frightened. I feel that man's need of deliverance is so terribly pressing that it will always haunt him. Nor does the widespread increase of Sunday recreation worry me much; our Lord can win boys and girls without our being obliged to shelter them from all other attractions.'

'But can you suggest—let me ask quite simply—how we can get them to church?'

'I am not quite sure if that is the right way to put it,' was the reply. 'I hope you won't be shocked if I tell you that I do not approve of perpetual visiting in the parish, with the object of asking people to come to church. I have never made such a request of a single parishioner of St. Martin's who has come to years of discretion—I don't of course mean that the parson is not to be friendly and neighbourly. But does not the secret lie here—that we must have something to offer in our churches so good that strangers will come without being asked, except perhaps by their lay friends? The ministry of the laity should be used much more in this way; and I believe that if a priest is doing his best, and is inspired by a real love for our Lord, he ought not to worry as much as the clergy do now about the failures, but leave them to God, Who (we must believe) will go on calling them to Himself, even if we never get them inside a church.'

'Something so good to offer them . . .' I thought of the bountiful fare provided at St. Martin's—services, music, lectures, the Guild of Fellowship, and so on—and I expressed the doubt whether such provision were at all possible in nine churches out of ten.

'Perhaps not,' Mr. Sheppard replied. 'But what we can do everywhere, in the smallest village church or in Bethnal Green, is to make our church services far less adequate and efficient. There is something terribly formal about the set paraphernalia of the ordinary church, and we must make the atmosphere less stiff and more homely. I should be quite pleased if we were to break down in a new hymn occasionally at St. Martin's: it is one of the things that help to make a service natural. Above all, our services must be made shorter. It is monstrous to expect people to be able to keep their attention fixed for ninety minutes and more on end, when we clergy are incapable ourselves of doing it. In my judgment no service should be allowed to exceed one hour.'

'And what would you make the central service for Sunday?'

'Surely there can be none other than the Holy Eucharist. But I am not in favour of people attending it twice every Sunday. In different places and at different times I have tried every experiment I could think of, and I am now convinced that *the* service is a sung Eucharist, at 9.15 or 10.15, at which a very large percentage of the congregation will make their communion, and with no question whether they have already had their breakfast or not. Eleven or half-past is too late, especially for people who want to get out into the open air on Sunday; and I would take care that whatever music we had would be familiar to the worshippers—you can't, I believe, find anything better than Merbecke for a general congregation. I would have no professional choir at such a service—nor indeed at any service. This is, in general, my solution of the problem of Sunday worship.'

'And what would you do,' I asked, 'for the ordinary Englishman who likes his sermon?'

'I would, of course, let him have it; but I do not believe that instruction and worship go together. I would have the sermon at another time, so that it would be separated from any thought that people who are listening to a sermon are worshipping God.'

We passed on to talk of the warning given by the Archbishop of Canterbury some time ago on the poorness of Anglican preaching, and I asked Mr. Sheppard whether he thought that we needed a new orientation in our sermons.

'Certainly not, if by "new" you mean a message that has not been given for the last eighteen hundred years. But if you are going to make people religious, you must make them think, and no preacher can do this unless he has thought and thought again himself. He owes this quite tremendous debt to his congregation, merely out of respect for them, apart altogether from the higher motives; and it is this weakness that people notice so

much in our sermons to-day. And as to the message—I know of nothing that can touch and reach and keep people except the perpetual holding up of our Lord's Living Personality, and His power to help and teach and save. And I lay stress on that word "teach." If I may say a special word about St. Martin's, it would be that we try to place our Lord on the horizon of the congregation and to tell them to live by His principles. But I like to regard it as an evangelistic centre, from which worshippers can go out to other churches—as I have repeatedly advised some of them to go—which may be of greater help in keeping them near our Lord. Our objective is not to try to get crowds of people and keep them—unless they find that the message at St. Martin's satisfies them—but to tell them to go on thinking and praying a great deal, till they find the church that helps to bind them most closely to Him, and makes them the best neighbours to their fellow-men throughout the week.'

I do not think it is too much to say that St. Martin's has made many who long to see the Church's influence extended wonder whether it is not prophetic of the way in which much of the Church's work will be organised in the future, and I wondered how far Mr. Sheppard saw possibilities of its serving as a model elsewhere.

'I attach the greatest importance,' he said, 'to the future reorganisation of the Church. I cannot tell you how much I long to see a bishop who will have the courage not to fill livings in parishes where a church is unnecessary. In some of our huge dioceses it is utterly impossible for a bishop to know what is going on in every parish; if some of them did know, they would close at least a third of the churches in some of our great cities as soon as ever the livings became vacant. My heart goes out to thousands of parish priests who are never seen by their bishops, who only hear from them through formal notices, and who are breaking their

hearts at an impossible job, from which for many there is no discharge till the day of their death. Which do you think would be likely to create the right kind of atmosphere and to rally people to the Church—four churches in a district crammed to the door, or a dozen nearly empty? The future of the Church—and the bishops know it as well as we do, for in the towns at least the parochial system has already broken down—lies in the formation and adequate staffing of strong centres, rather than in a mass of scattered congregations, who are bound to suffer from that terrible depression which seems since the war to have laid its hold upon the Church.'

'You would think that, even if the number of ordination candidates were to increase?'

'Yes. But I do not see any turn of the tide as yet, in the number of men coming forward. Nor do I think it will come, until the appeal which we make to young men and the way in which we train them are radically altered. I doubt whether it is possible to depict the life of the ordinary parish priest in the kind of way that will attract the more adventurous of the young. I know all about the intellectual difficulties, and the financial difficulties, and the rest: but I believe that these weigh comparatively little in the scale as compared with the distaste that young men feel for a life which they believe to be bounded by mothers' meetings and district visiting.'

'And what of the training?'

'Well, there are two sides of that on which I think much more stress should be laid. I believe that the least satisfactory training a man can have is to go direct from an Oxford or Cambridge college, where he meets men more or less of a type, to a theological college where he will meet others of the same type, and then pass straight to his ordination. You and I know the gratitude that hundreds of clergy to-day feel for the training that they had at the Oxford House, where—as laymen—they met men and boys on a more natural footing than is often possible after they have been ordained; and that experi-

ence made the whole difference to the first few years of their ministry, and to the confidence with which they were able to begin their work. But all this matters less than the one thing needful—which is that a man should be filled with the love of our Lord, for only so can he ever hope to speak of God's love to His people.'

'Would you be in favour of filling up the ranks of the clergy with women ministers?'

'I am not an advocate of the ministry of women, but for the life of me I don't know why. I have often thought about it, and I am not sure that there is any reason but prejudice why we should not have women priests. Of one thing, at least, I am certain: if the Church of Rome were to start ordaining women, the Church of England would soon follow suit.'

I recalled, as I left Mr. Sheppard, one of the remarks made to me by Mr. Studdert-Kennedy which I quoted in a previous interview—'The two things that will attract people to the Church are personality and fellowship.' I know Mr. Sheppard will forgive me if I write that these two words might serve as a motto for St. Martin's. Like others, I could riddle the system with criticisms, but—as I have written before—my object in these interviews is rather to tell members of the Church of England something of her prophets and wise men, so that they may know that they have not altogether perished out of the land. Of the fellowship to be found at the church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields there is no need to testify. The stranger and the friend, the sinner and the saint, the hopeless and the homeless, have all found shelter within its walls, and for each there is welcome and help: the patron saint of the church is not forgotten by members of the congregation. Nor dare I say much of the personality of its vicar. To those who know it the words would be banal and inadequate; and it requires more art than I can command to attempt a description that would make it a living picture for those

who have never met him. (It has been done once, by the way, by the present Bishop of Chester, in the *Oxford House Magazine*, when Mr. Sheppard gave up the headship, and done with all the grace of a Paget's pen.) . . . And there is another reason. When you speak of personality, you mean that indefinable genius—given by God to so few—which can communicate itself and can make an impression that endures, especially in those intimate talks and letters that pass between friend and friend. Of these, clearly, I cannot write; but I will attempt to state what I feel in a closing sentence. The day will come—God keep it far off!—when somebody will be entrusted with the writing of Mr. Sheppard's life. And the usual request from the biographer will appear in the papers, asking for letters, which 'will be carefully kept and returned as soon as copied.' Mr. Sheppard is a younger man than I am, and his life is as good as mine; but, if by any chance he should die before me, I shall read that request for his letters. And I shall know that the biographer will receive many hundreds . . . but he will not get mine.

THE RIGHT REVEREND MICHAEL FURSE, BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS

An eminent lawyer recently suggested, with characteristic taste, that Dr. Furse was appointed (thirty-one years ago) Fellow and Dean of Trinity College, Oxford, more for his physical than his intellectual endowments. Those who were up at Oxford during the bishop's early years at Trinity will remember the success with which he grappled with the extremely difficult task of restoring—I don't think the word is too unkind to his predecessor—order in the college. Indeed, I only recall two failures which could be laid at his door in the four years during which I remember the dean at Oxford. The first was the failure to prevent one of the Trinity Torpids from suffering bumps night after night, one year, in spite of his assiduous coaching—I expect I am not alone in remembering the cry, shouted scornfully at the eight exhausted men through a megaphone from the Long Bridges, 'Bumped by ——'! (But wild horses would not draw from me the name of the college to which it was such an indignity for a Trinity boat to lower its flag.) The other was a failure, even more pronounced, to find work for a rather vague, if confident, undergraduate who appeared before him at the Oxford Appointments Board with the object of getting some work when he went down—a tutorship to a Rajah's son, for instance, which was the hope of most idle men at the end of their time at Oxford in those days, especially if they knew Mr. Raper, whose pockets were popularly supposed to be stuffed with letters from Indian princes, offering fabulous sums for English tutors. The undergraduate failed to impress the dean with his qualifications,

and in answer to the final question—Well, can you do *any*thing ?—there was nothing for me to do but to retire with as little loss of dignity as possible.

But the eminent lawyer was wrong, and every subsequent step in the bishop's career has proved how wrong he was. It required more than physical prowess to rule and guide the diocese of Pretoria for eleven years. Not many members of the episcopal bench to-day have a wider conception than the Bishop of St. Albans of the problems with which the Church of England is confronted, or bring a saner judgment to bear upon them ; and those who have sat under the bishop in Retreat know best the white-hot flame of the Spirit that burns in him, and the depth of personal devotion and study with which it is kept burning.

It would, I think, be true to say that the bishop's main interest—next to that of his own diocese—is the World Call, and it was to hear his views on the progress of the Call that I visited the delightful home into which he had just moved at the Abbey Gate House. Dr. Furse was by no means discouraged at the response already made, as his reply to my first question showed :

' I consider that already the response has been wonderful. I know that there are some enthusiasts who hoped that by the end of this year we should have had hundreds more men and women in the mission field, and that hundreds of thousands more pounds would have been received by the missionary societies. But I would plead with them and all churchpeople to remember that the World Call must filter down stage by stage—from the Westminster Convention to the Church Assembly, so to the dioceses, and then into the rural deaneries and parishes. A word of warning is necessary. We must give it time. It is the way of the Church of England to expect everything at once. If we don't get what we hope for in a moment, we get tired of one thing and start on something else. Do not let us make this mistake over the

World Call. I am absolutely certain that a movement is beginning which is not going to stop. Already the achievement has been immense. We have been made to face the situation. This must and will react on our whole Church life. A great response is to be expected.'

I questioned the bishop on the grounds for his optimism, and he replied that this rested largely on the fact that the Missionary Council was setting about its work in the right way, and 'putting first things first.'

'I have no hesitation,' he added, 'in saying that the most urgent need is the education of both clergy and laity. The missionary schools, which are now held all over the country, are proving of the greatest value, and we are now tackling the question of forming Schools of Prayer. It is time that we knew and taught something of the Science and the Art of Prayer. Let me give you an instance of what I mean. Before my Synod in 1923, I sent round a questionnaire as to the instruction given by parish priests to their candidates for Confirmation, etc. One of the questions was—What schemes have you for teaching the Faith to adults, apart from sermons and addresses in Church? Another was—What schemes have you for teaching the Science and the Art of Prayer? Nobody answered the second; and even the best fellows said that they had never really tackled either of them. You see, then, our first need: we must put our people through a course of training in prayer.'

We passed to the problem of man-power, which is vexing the minds of bishops, priests, and laymen to-day; and I asked the bishop whether any practical policy could be worked out, by which the home and mission fields should each receive its due share of workers, without starving or hindering the other.

'I have no doubt of it,' was the reply. 'Let me give you an analogy. During the last years of the war, there was a great and increasing call for chaplains to the Forces. What did we do? We put the dioceses on

a quota; the number of clergy in each was carefully gone into, and its needs considered; and each diocese was held responsible for sparing a definite number of clergy for the Forces on active service, and not those who could be most easily dispensed with! I believe that something along those lines could be done with success, in response to the World Call. All the facts are now marshalled, and we should treat the Mission Field in the same way as we treated the Front during the war. The steps to be taken would not be difficult or elaborate. Each diocese would be allotted its quota, and be responsible for sending out a certain number of men. The bishop would then tell his diocese how many men it was responsible for, and would ask for volunteers. He would then give the Call with Authority to certain men, and ask them to consider seriously whether they ought not to go: the ultimate decision, of course, must be left to the individual. It is not the wisest policy to depend entirely on volunteers for particular jobs, especially for important jobs. Have you ever heard of anybody, for instance, volunteering to be Archbishop of Canterbury?'

'Not exactly volunteering,' I replied. 'But I want to be quite clear what you mean by the Call with Authority. Do you mean that a clergyman should place himself unreservedly in the hands of his bishop, to go wherever the bishop may wish to send him?'

'Not quite,' the bishop answered, 'for reasons which I will give you presently. But let me give an instance from my diocese in Africa. Another African diocese was desperately short-handed during the war, and the Archbishop asked me (among other diocesan bishops) if I could spare a man. We were almost "down to the bone" ourselves, as we had sent almost all our able-bodied clergy to the war. But I called my native priests together, and told them we had to supply one native priest for a year, to help a diocese more in distress than their own. I then asked them whether they would prefer

to volunteer for this work or that I should choose one of them. After some consultation among themselves, they asked me to choose one. In due course I did so, and he went. Exactly a year—to the day—later, I was sitting in my study and saw this native priest, whom I believed to be three hundred miles away, walking up the path. I went to meet him, and he said with a smile, "I promised to go for a year; and now I have come back." This is by the way; but it illustrates what I mean. Is it always reasonable to expect a man to volunteer to leave his work, to which he believes God has called him, in order to go out to new work of which he knows little or nothing, and to which he has had no such direct call?'

'What, then, is your plan?' I asked.

'We must take the whole matter much further back. We have got to start from the day of Ordination. I don't ordain anyone in my diocese who will not give me an assurance that in Ordination he regards himself as taking office "in the Church of God," and not merely in the Church of England, and is willing to give me an undertaking that he recognises that his ministry may not be confined to the Church of England in England, and that therefore there is a contingent liability resting upon him to serve anywhere. Once you had that fact recognised, combined with the quota system for the dioceses, we should in time find it easier to give an adequate answer to the call of the Mission Field.'

We discussed next the term of service for which clergymen should volunteer for the Mission Field, and the much vexed question of the treatment accorded to missionaries by the home Church on their return.

'On the first point,' the bishop said, 'I can only speak with first-hand knowledge of Africa. It is quite clear that, for work among the natives, short-term service is of very little help. We have to pay a man's passage out and home, and it would not be worth while to do it for,

say, three years, for it would take him all that time to learn his job. But I am strongly in favour of the short-term work, for instance, in India for 'Varsity men. It would be an enormous help to send them out for a short time, especially if they were afterwards intending to be ordained.'

'And, on the other point,' I asked, 'have you found that missionaries are given the cold shoulder by the home Church on their return?'

'I can only say,' was the reply, 'that during all my seventeen years in Africa I do not remember one instance of a man of any worth who came back and found himself out of work for any length of time. But it depends a good deal on the bishops in the Mission Field and at home. I have written a letter, as chairman of the Home Base Committee, to diocesan bishops abroad, to say that it is essential for them to tell us, quite honestly, if confidentially, of the weaknesses as well as the virtues of the people who are coming home. But no man ever came to me to ask if he should go to the Mission Field, to whom I did not say—Burn your boats, and don't worry about when you will get back. It is no good to attempt to work in the Mission Field with half an eye on England all the time.'

'And now,' I said, 'I want to relate what you have told me to the shortage of clergy at home. You must have often heard the objection to sending men abroad that there are not enough to go round in England.'

'Of course I have,' replied the bishop, 'but we must keep a sense of proportion. In deciding the relative importance of Church work in England or overseas, the first thing is to avoid the greatest possible fallacy, which is to reckon by numbers and population. You can, of course, make out a case for the need in enormous parishes at home, but if you merely take numbers, the need of the Mission Field as a whole is far greater. But population is not everything. In the Northern Transvaal, for instance, you might get a congregation at half a dozen

centres of ten apiece ; but it is a country in the making, and each of these ten is a spiritual centre for others with quite enormous potentialities for good or ill in the whole future of South Africa. Besides, I would say that the situation in India and Africa is much more critical to-day even than it is in England.'

'And this would mean,' I suggested, 'a considerable amount of reorganisation in the home Church ?'

'It would ; and that need is imperative. But the difficulties are very great. You cannot, for instance, disturb the present holders of livings ; but it is monstrous that a strong man who is not a scholar or a theologian should regard it as a whole-time job to be in charge of a parish of under two hundred people. Many churches, of course, should be shut up, and amalgamation of parishes should be carried out as far as possible. But here we are up against local prejudice, which stops us again and again. And you see what this opposition means : it means that ordinary churchpeople are not at present interested in the Mission Field. But there is more to be said,' the bishop went on, 'than this. There must be a radical reconsideration of the methods to be adopted in doing our work. We have got to get back to our Lord's way, from which we have wandered very far. A man put in charge of a parish of 10,000 people spreads himself over the whole lot. It would be far better to work from the centre outwards ; I don't mean by copying the methods of some priests I know, who provide an enormous number of services and spoon-feed their people in a kind of hot-house atmosphere, and never seem to be able to train them not only to look after themselves but to go out and fetch somebody else in. What I fear most with regard to the shortage of clergy is that, under great pressure from overworked parish priests, we bishops should ordain men who have really neither the natural gifts nor the training which will make good priests. We must pick and choose those who at least show some gift for leading others.'

'Do you feel the same about the laity?'

'Certainly I do. All we seem to have discovered so far for the lay folk to do is to put them on a committee and make them raise money. At present most of them have no message to give. We want, as with the clergy, to pick them out carefully one by one and teach and train them in their religion, so that they may be able to take a real hand in the work. It may seem the longest way round, but it would be the quickest in the end. It has been said that the Englishman is reticent in talking about his religion. He is certainly not reticent if he happens to be a Christian Scientist, and the reason why the ordinary churchman is reticent is because he knows hardly anything about his Faith, and has had very little personal spiritual experience.'

We turned from the problem of Men to that of Money, and I asked the bishop whether he thought that we could dispense with some of the luxuries in our worship at home.

'Undoubtedly we could,' he replied. 'The idea, for instance, that a parish should put off a scheme for a new organ, so as to be able to spare more money for the Mission Field, would sound absurd to the average congregation, though it would nearly always be right. But it is a bigger question than one of mere luxury. The real trouble is that there is so very little team work in an English diocese; if there were more team work, a diocese would decide on a definite line of policy in expenditure for five or ten years—so much for keeping up ancient buildings, so much for home work and education, so much for Missions Overseas, and so on. And we should work as a team to get it, and see that the various Missionary Societies had what they needed.'

'You think, then,' I asked, 'that the Societies are likely to be permanent?'

'That is looking rather far ahead,' the bishop replied. 'But when people say that the Church ought to be its

own Missionary Society, they really can't know much about the Societies' work. Nobody regards them as ideal, but they are here; they know their job, which they have done for years; and any attempt to uproot them would be absurd. People are always saying that, if it were not for the Societies, more money would find its way to the Mission Field. I doubt this very much. But it is probable that there will be a greater centralisation of funds in future.'

'Does that mean that the diocesan associations will disappear?'

'Not altogether, at any rate for some time. I had one for the Pretoria diocese, but only to raise £1000 a year, and with a very slight organisation. It was my own friends and people who were chiefly interested, and I never pushed it more than to get me that thousand pounds each year. But the ideal way is for provinces, rather than dioceses, to be represented by associations at home. It would be difficult at present for the different associations to give up their work; but in Africa, for instance, Johannesburg and Pretoria are already one, and Southern Rhodesia is coming in, and in time, I believe, there will be one for the whole of South Africa. Remember, too, about the Societies, that they are all represented on the Missionary Council, and are working with complete unanimity, which, I think, is one of the most remarkable achievements of the last two or three years.'

This word prompted my last question, whether through the World Call there might not arise a deeper unity within the Church of England.

'If we respond to it,' the bishop said, 'we may gain a greater unity than we have yet known. The World Call is making the Church of England realise that it is no longer a little body, but has a great responsibility as wide as the world. Once we understand that fully, we shall put first things first; and this cannot but have its effect upon our divisions. The things that now divide

us will assume their right proportion, and we shall see how small they are beside the great message which God is laying upon this generation to proclaim in every land.'

I have tried since to summarise in my mind the message which Dr. Furse would give to the Church on the World Call, and it is something like this—Add to your faith patience, and to your patience courage and common sense. It is difficult to express all that the Church gains by having men like the Bishops of Salisbury and St. Albans on the episcopal bench at home. To the vision of prophets they add the knowledge of the practical needs and problems of the Church overseas, and with such leadership the response is assured. . . . 'We must give it time,' said the Bishop of St. Albans. *Deus patiens quia æternus.*

DR. CYRIL NORWOOD

'Not to River nor Royal Keep,
Low Meads nor level Close,
Up to the sturdy wind-worn steep,
Levavi oculos.
To four red walls on a skyward climb,
Towering over the fields and Time.'

MANY who were not taught at Harrow, and who remember perhaps a 'level Close'—especially one Close where some of us have seen 'W. G.' bowling at the cricket nets on a summer evening—love the jingle of these lines; and if the 'skyward climb' is stiff, there is full reward at the top of it, in the peace of the lovely church where Thomas Becket said Mass, and in the view from the churchyard—never more beautiful, I should think, than on a September afternoon, with the glory of its rose-trees not yet past, and, in the haze beneath, London, inexorable and all-devouring, creeping slowly nearer to 'The Hill' with rail and villa and road. Nor need one be a Harrovian to bow the head in reverence before a tablet on the wall of John Lyon's old schoolroom:

NEAR THIS SPOT
ANTHONY ASHLEY
AFTERWARDS 7TH EARL OF SHAFTESBURY, K.G.
WHILE YET A BOY IN HARROW SCHOOL
SAW WITH SHAME AND INDIGNATION
THE PAUPER'S FUNERAL
WHICH HELPED TO AWAKEN HIS LIFELONG
DEVOTION TO THE SERVICE OF THE POOR
AND THE OPPRESSED.

It is words like these that make one desire to 'incorporate tradition and prolong the reign of the dead'; but of late voices have been heard to proclaim that much of the tradition might be left to rest in oblivion, and that the dead had best reign over the dead, while the living look for a sovereign to inaugurate a dynasty of wider range and potency. Certainly at Oxford, two years ago, in the Education Section of the British Association, phrases were flung about which made one wonder whether the public schools were still holding their own in the life of the nation, or whether (like the Church and the British Constitution, and several other things long regarded as entirely durable and lovable) they were not 'in the melting pot.' Many headmasters are good headmasters; one at least to-day is an ardent educationalist as well as a great headmaster. And it was for this reason—because of the depth of his knowledge and sympathy—that I asked the Headmaster of Harrow to spare me an hour of his time, and either to reassure me or to send me doubtful away.

I began by asking Dr. Norwood's opinion of the paper read before the British Association by Mr. Ronald Gurner, on 'The Public Schools and the National Life.'

'It was an exaggerated statement,' he replied. 'You can find the practical proof that the schools still stand high in public opinion in the pressure now being put on them to find more places. They are fuller than ever, and every school has a waiting list. As to the statement that "the system puts a premium on muscle, not on brain," I should say that, on the whole, boys' values are not very far wrong. The good athlete is, of course, still popular in a way that the good scholar is not; but in the last thirty years the boys' values have been steadily improving, as other interests besides those of athletics have developed; and the worship of muscle is much less prominent than it used to be.'

'Do you find,' I asked, 'that the boys still come from the same type of family?'

'On the whole, I should say so. But it would be rash to prophesy how long this will last. Many parents are obliged to use capital to educate their children, and the professional classes are spending their savings. This, of course, cannot go on for ever. With regard to the so-called "profiteer," his boys are not very obvious in the public schools, though, of course, specimens can be found—and it is very good that they should be.'

I quoted Mr. Gurner's dictum that the system led to the 'crushing of personality,' and Dr. Norwood agreed that, if it were true, the public schools would not make the best preparation for a career in life.

'But,' he commented, 'I should say again that this is an over-statement. If by the phrase you mean that there are things which are "not done" according to school etiquette, there is a certain truth in it; but these things are mostly concerned with such trivialities as waistcoat buttons and the turning up of trousers; and the retention of these small customs can hardly be said to "crush out the personality" of the boys. The system seems to me as good as anything we can get for the general education of character, and the development of powers of leadership. It does give the ordinary boy responsibility. It enables him to understand fairness, and "playing the game," and looking after other people. And it is largely to this type of education that I attribute the Englishman's success in opening up the Empire and in dealing with backward races.'

'Do you think,' I asked, 'that the system of prefects or monitors has helped to bring out the boys' powers of leadership?'

'Yes; but all that has changed a good deal of late years. There is not so much scope now for the prefects as there used to be years ago. In Arnold's day there were no organised games and much more spare time;

and the whole school life was rougher. School monitors were then a sort of personal guard of the headmaster, and had a much bigger task in the maintaining of order than now. To-day the boys' time is fully occupied. There is the rivalry of houses, for instance, and many other interests, such as music and art, natural history, workshop, and hobbies, which fill their day; so that there is not so much for the prefects to do. But their authority is real in so far as they function inside their houses, and I am not sure that we want to see things other than they are.'

There were two other small points that had received mention at the Oxford meeting, on which I asked Dr. Norwood for his views. Corporal punishment, he thought, should be carefully watched—'but I regard it as the best way of dealing with many little offences; it is soon over and done with.' (Dulcie Grimston's consolation, I remembered, to poor Mr. Bultitude!) 'It is not practical politics to make distinctions between boys of different temperaments in a matter of this kind. There may be a few boys to whom it would be harmful; but the truth is that some boys ought never to go to a public school, and many parents try to force boys into a life for which they are not suited. In my last two years at Marlborough I only beat two boys.'

The other point was the public school novel. Had a single good one yet been written? I own to a great affection for 'The Lanchester Tradition' and Dr. Norwood agreed that it was good—of the masters. 'But,' he added, 'you can never get one really good of the boys. There is a certain monotony and routine about school life that doesn't lend itself to story telling, and, in order to make a good tale, a jumble of incidents is crowded into a short space, which tends to make the whole story unreal.'

We passed on to talk of the attitude of parents towards the public schools' curriculum, and the much vexed question of a classical education. The parents, in

Dr. Norwood's experience, are usually willing to be guided—' and if the boys have a literary bent, they don't press for a scientific education, but are willing that their sons should learn Latin and Greek. My own opinion is that it is desirable to have a general education on common lines for all boys under sixteen, or sixteen and a half'—I wondered whether Dr. Norwood could have converted the parent of a small boy in the Fourth Standard, who one day delivered to his teacher a crumpled note which ran: " Plese, sir, don't teach my boy any more poitry, he's goin' to be a groser"—'after that, an able boy can specialise along the lines for which he is most fitted. There is ample material among the masters in the public schools, and the special subjects out of which choice can be made are very wide. The great rival of classics to-day, let me say, is not science but history. For myself, I should not regard an education as complete without Latin, though I do not feel this so strongly about Greek.'

'Do you have,' I asked, in parenthesis, 'the old pronunciation of Latin, or the new, at Harrow?'

'The new. It is fairly general now in the public schools, and the younger masters bring it with them from the universities. The only difficulty,' Dr. Norwood added with a smile, 'is that in schools where you have a Latin oration at prize-giving, the old boys find it rather difficult to follow.'

'And how far has your curriculum to be fixed with an eye to subsequent education at Oxford or Cambridge?'

'The schools are now as free as they want to be, in their connection with the universities; and the school work is largely guided by the School Certificate examinations. Schoolmasters either sit or are represented on the Authority, and the examinations follow the lines of the work done in school. The universities do not interfere further, and on the whole the scholarship exams. are very good.'

The mention of scholarships led me to ask Dr. Norwood whether he thought the public schools were now gaining as many scholarships as they used to, and I quoted a statistical table I had read, according to which they did not seem to compare favourably with the secondary schools.

'I remember those statistics,' was the reply, 'and I read them carefully. But the compiler seemed to forget that in the public schools there are about 20,000 boys, and in the secondary schools perhaps more than a quarter of a million; and this number is still increasing. A secondary school may get a good scholarship once in every two years, but, if you think of the number of boys, you will see that the proportion of their scholarships is not to be compared quite at its face value with that gained from the public schools. In saying this, I would not for a moment detract from the successes gained by the secondary schools. The more their boys win scholarships at the university, the better.'

'Another point that struck me about those statistics,' I said, 'was the difference between the various public schools. From Marlborough, for instance, you gained thirty-one scholarships that year—all of them, if I remember rightly, open scholarships—and twenty-five the year after.'

'Yes; but I don't think the explanation is as difficult as it seems. As to the successive years—if once you can lift a form to a certain level of scholarship, you are setting a standard; and the boys will continually be trying to reach the standard of their predecessors. On the main point, it is important to remember that the type of boy varies a good deal in different schools. There was splendid material at Marlborough, because the boys came mostly from business and professional families, in which the fathers had had to depend largely on their own efforts, and the boys would do the same. We were also helped by close entrance scholarships for the sons of clergy. This was fine material, for these

boys had been brought up to believe that they, too, would have to earn their own living; and the getting of scholarships is much more important to them than to boys such as you find in the richer schools, who are hoping to inherit a country place or an independent income, or are going into Parliament. With them there is no spur, such as there is at Marlborough or at my own school, Merchant Taylors', where the boys know that their future depends largely on themselves. And this is the spur which is working strongly now in the State-aided schools.'

'Did you notice,' I asked, 'Sir Robert Blair's plea that boys who had started in the elementary schools should be able to proceed by scholarships to the public schools?

'I did. But I wonder whether Sir Robert Blair had considered the enormous practical difficulties involved. In the elementary schools they teach neither Latin nor French, and the boys simply could not do the work. I think there might be more hope in passing boys on from secondary schools to the public schools. But here, again, the difficulties are very great. I had thought out and prepared a scheme which was accepted by the Headmasters' Conference—a system of scholarships for boys from secondary schools at the age of thirteen-and-a-half to fourteen. The proposal was that the boys should not be chosen by competitive intellectual examination, but they would be boys fitted by character and ability to profit by a public school education. The public schools were to teach them for nothing, and the State was to pay the boarding fees. The headmasters were ready to accept this, but the idea got no further owing to the opposition of the Board of Education and the hostility of the headmasters of secondary schools, who regarded it as an insidious attempt to skim the cream from their schools.'

'And what of the other ways of making contacts of this kind?' I asked. 'Do you think it can be done through the school Missions?'

'Up to a point,' Dr. Norwood replied, 'but it is not easy to interest the boys in the school Mission, unless—as here at Harrow—it is within easy reach of the school. The great difficulty is to prevent the boys' interest in the Mission from becoming artificial. The most successful experiment of the kind, I think, was one which is now an established practice at Marlborough. A number of Swindon boys used to come to the school for their holidays at the end of the summer term, and for ten days they became Marlborough boys. They occupied the school buildings, and lived the life of a public school boy, with Chapel services, common meals, house competitions at cricket and football, and so on. The club itself was in Swindon, and boys from one or other of the Marlborough houses visited it every week. The club and the school were only ten miles apart, so that it was possible for friendships to be maintained.'

I now came to the subject on which above all I was anxious to hear Dr. Norwood's views—the religion of the public school boy. Nor was I surprised when he asked me to think a little further back than the time when the boys first came under his care.

'The home training, as you must know,' he said, 'is not what it was. That is the first fact we have to reckon with. Nowadays boys leave home with very little knowledge of the Bible and often with no Church background or religious tradition in the family. Church-going is not normal among parents; I found the same at Marlborough as here, and in this all public schools are alike.'

'Are the boys themselves hostile to religion?'

'Not a bit. After the war there was a certain reaction against compulsory chapels, as there was against many established practices; but all that has died down. The boys are quite willing to go to chapel, unless ideas against it are put into their heads from outside. They regard it as a normal part of the school life and tradition.'

'And what kind of service do you consider best for them?'

'Mattins and Evensong, with short lessons, hearty hymns and good psalms, in which the whole school can get going together. It is easy to belittle this, but I am thinking of the *whole* school, with boys of every kind in it.'

I remembered a story of a boy who had been taken to a Choral Eucharist every Sunday by his mother, and whose first letter from his public school began: 'Dear Mummy,—We had such a funny service in chapel this morning: something like Evensong, only much longer and much duller'! And I asked Dr. Norwood whether he thought that a more devotional atmosphere could be created by a Choral Eucharist for the whole school.

'It might perhaps succeed,' he replied, 'in a certain type of school, where there was a fine chapel building and good music. But honestly, I am suspicious of it. Boys are charmed by music, and may easily mistake the æsthetic influence for devotion. Again and again I am struck with the fact that, in almost all academic discussions on public school religion, people speak as if they expected the devotional state of mind of a man of twenty-five in a boy of sixteen or eighteen.'

'Do you find the boys responsive to good preaching?'

'Yes; if the appeal is the right one.'

I told Dr. Norwood how the headmaster of a public school once whispered to me with a shudder, in the vestry of a school chapel—'I hope you won't talk to the boys like the preacher last Sunday: he told them to "take God with them into the scrum."'

'That sort of thing,' he replied, 'is, of course, useless. Nobody is quicker than a boy to notice when a preacher is talking down to him. The best thing to do is to forget the Thirds and Fourths, and the masters, and to talk to the Fifths and Sixths. The lower boys will listen, if the sermon is good, even if they can't

understand it all. And the two great appeals of the preacher should be—Service and Conduct.'

'You would not, then, preach much on the mystical and devotional side of religion?'

'Not to the whole school. But it should certainly not be omitted at voluntary services, at services in preparation for Holy Communion, and before Confirmation. I have heard sermons on prayer attempted at the full school services, but never with success, though I have heard it done with great success at voluntary services; and it is most important that there should be these occasional opportunities for voluntary worship.'

'When you speak of the appeal to service, would you include in that an appeal to the boys to think of Ordination?'

'Not specifically. The best way is to put the call for service before the boys, and then leave the seed to fructify. The appeal to take Holy Orders can be very much overdone. In my last two years at Marlborough we had five such appeals from strange preachers, and the boys in the end just shut their ears. But they will listen to an appeal from a clergyman in a large parish, or a missionary, who speaks of the attractiveness of his own work. They might easily be persuaded to take Holy Orders by a call to service, but the appeal must not be *ad hoc*. It may interest you to know,' Dr. Norwood added, 'that when I left Marlborough there were between thirty and forty boys who had expressed their intention of being ordained. Five years previously there were only three. I think the tide is beginning to turn.'

My next question was of the best age for Confirmation.

'I don't think,' Dr. Norwood replied, 'that there is much wrong with the present average age—fifteen or sixteen. My practical experience has led me to believe that this is better than Confirmation at a preparatory school: I have noticed a tendency for those who come already confirmed from their preparatory school to be slacker than those confirmed at fifteen or sixteen in

coming to the Holy Communion. And I am convinced that the preparation should be in the hands of the housemasters. It is difficult to speak too highly of the immense trouble which most lay housemasters take over their classes. They interview every boy privately, and at Marlborough no housemaster accepted a house unless he was willing to prepare his boys for Confirmation. Nobody in the world can do it so well. If boys are confirmed at their preparatory school, there is nothing to bring them to their bearings during the age of difficulties, when a boy wants somebody to help him to break down the barriers of reserve. The housemaster has a chance of getting in touch with his boys at Confirmation which he would have in no other way.'

'You don't, then, approve of having a school chaplain?'

'No. Once in a hundred times, with the rarest personality, it may work; but generally—without faults on either side—it produces a distinct, if conventional, hostility in the housemasters. You must either have the system of chaplains in all houses, or trust the housemasters and dispense with chaplains. But I have only had experience of the housemaster system, and I don't believe that you can drive both horses at once.'

We spoke of much else that I have no space to set down here; and I felt, when our talk was over, that if ever the public school system needed apologists, the headmaster of Harrow should be their 'first string.' On every subject, as we passed from one to another, there was conviction; and for every conviction there was a reason: yet none, it seemed to me, could understand more clearly or more generously the outlook of those who would not agree with him. And I hazard the guess that it must be this rare mixture of sympathy and strength which has raised Dr. Norwood's name to high honour among the boys and masters who have lived under his rule. Of one thing I am sure. In days when the critic

of every tradition—' Whose castle's Doubting and whose name's Despair '—makes one wonder whether any institution with a past is worth preserving, none but those with a profound faith can convince the world of the continued usefulness of long-established things. And if faith in a system be the first virtue needed in those who are called upon to work it, it would be safe to prophesy many years of happiness for the headmaster of Harrow, in the great work to which he has set his hand.

THE RT. HON. LORD HUGH CECIL, M.P.

I ONCE received a letter from a shrewd and vigilant clergyman, which ended with the question—'Have you noticed the growth of an anti-Church-Assembly feeling in the Church? Is there anything in it, do you think?' My reply was that it was possible to trace such a feeling in certain quarters, though I denied stoutly that it was as widespread as the words 'in the Church' seemed to suggest. The Church includes the laity, and among them at least there is little sign of such feeling to be traced, partly because few, even of regular and loyal churchpeople, display any interest in the Assembly and its doings; partly because nothing has happened in the Assembly to make the laity either particularly kindly or particularly ill-disposed towards it. There is, however, ground for the contention that such a feeling exists among the clergy, though to what extent it is prevalent it is difficult to say. The critics will raise their voices in censure where the contented are satisfied to approve in silence; and the extent of a storm cannot be gauged by the noise of the thunder immediately over one's head. But the critics have certainly become more vocal of late. The Assembly is going too fast; it is hurrying and scamping its work; its Measures do not receive adequate discussion; it is heedless of the financial pressure on the parish priests; it is playing fast and loose with their rights; and so on. . . . 'Is there anything in it, do you think?' It was in order that I might answer this question the better that I sought out Lord Hugh Cecil, who speaks with a wide knowledge of administrative assemblies, who has kept a guiding hand on the Church

Assembly from its first day until now, and whose judgment that body has learned implicitly to trust. It is not too much to say that without him the Assembly would not be complete.

My first question was concerned with the complaints that have been recently made that the parochial clergy are not adequately represented in the Assembly; and I asked Lord Hugh Cecil whether he thought that there was any means by which this grievance, if it was a grievance, could be remedied.

'The representation of the clergy,' he replied, 'as you know, was decided by the Convocations. It was settled under the first Measure that we passed. The Convocations were declared to have the power of altering their representation by Canon, and the Convocation of Canterbury did so. It is not the business of the Assembly or of the laity generally to settle how the clergy should be represented. It is the business of the clergy themselves in their Convocations. And if they are not satisfied, it is quite easy for them to get it changed. To raise the question in the Assembly would be unnecessary and inconvenient; and it would be contrary to what should be called constitutional practice. By the Constitution the House of Clergy consists of the Lower Houses of the Convocations. If those Houses need reform, it is for the Convocations to carry it out.'

The next complaint which I put before Lord Hugh was the frequently heard criticism that the Assembly is 'run by officials,' and that the private members, no less than the parish priests throughout the Church, are at their mercy.

'As to that,' Lord Hugh replied, 'I do not think that the critics really mean what they say. Their complaint is not against the "officials," who (I suppose) are the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Secretary and myself, and perhaps the Chairmen of the Houses of Clergy and Laity. I am sure the critics would agree that we are all

friendly. It is really of the Members-in-Charge of the Measures that complaint is made. And it is too much to expect that the Members-in-Charge of a Measure, however considerate they may be, will be entirely sympathetic towards those who are opposing it. Members-in-Charge are not unfair to the critics, but they debate against them. The real grievance (if grievance there be) that the critics have is against the majority of the Assembly and of the House of Clergy, who, for instance, voted for the Clergy Pensions Measure. Officials do not stand in the way of the private members —they come to their rescue, and try to ensure them a fair hearing.'

I mentioned to Lord Hugh the distinction which, I think, should always be made between the complaints of the clergy about their financial losses on the one hand, and about their status on the other; and I read to him a letter which had appeared in the correspondence columns of the *Guardian* on the financial straits which many clergymen found themselves.

'That statement,' Lord Hugh replied, 'certainly suggests real hardship. But the principal grievance is obviously against Parliament over the Tithe Act. This Act is not the Assembly's fault. But this point has been already made more than once.'

'And what of the Dilapidations Measure?'

'The clergy cannot complain that the dilapidations charge is a new one. It is merely a rearranged charge. Under the old arrangement it was possible to postpone payment till after death. That is the whole difference; the clergy have to pay the charge in their lifetime, instead of leaving it to their heirs or executors.

'So far as pensions go,' Lord Hugh added, 'it is quite true that the clergy have to pay, and that the charge is a new one; but it must not be forgotten that pensions are granted on very favourable terms. What the complaint really means is that many of the clergy would rather not have a pension.'

'Is there anything, do you think, in the suggestion that these extra charges amount to a breach of contract with a man who took a living of a certain value, on which these charges were not payable when he was appointed incumbent?'

'No—it cannot be called a breach of contract, any more than that I entered on life with an income tax of 1s., and I have now to pay income tax of 3s. 6d. The real remedy, I am sure, is to appeal to the laity, and to ask them to bear part of the cost, or the whole. The dilapidations are charged on a benefice, not on a person; and it is hard on an incumbent to make him bear the whole cost of keeping the benefice up to its proper value. Machinery is set up in the Dilapidations Measure for enabling the laity to help, and the incumbent can always appeal to the Dilapidations Board.'

'But would you like,' I asked, 'if I may put it bluntly—would you like to go to a church council consisting almost entirely of agricultural labourers who were earning 30s. a week, and to say to them—"It is your duty to help to keep up this large and aged house in which I have to live"?'

'I should not mind doing so, because I should point out that I did not want to keep up the house for my own sake, but for the sake of the benefice. The parsonage house is their concern—not their property, but their concern. They derive benefit from having a vicarage house in the parish. If it is not a convenient house, of course, then by all means let it be changed, but there is provision made for that.'

We talked next of the Tithe Act, and I asked Lord Hugh whether he considered it a reasonable settlement, especially for the poorer clergy on whom the extra charge falls most heavily.

'On the whole, I think the Act was reasonable, in respect to the clergy. Parliament was much concerned about the clergy with small incomes. It was considered

not an unfavourable bargain for the clergy—and you will remember that the heaviest burden fell on such institutions as colleges and universities.'

I then emphasised the duty which I have always regarded as the first that should be undertaken by a Diocesan Finance Board—to make up the livings of the poorer clergy, so far as possible, to the amount which they had before the Tithe Act was passed.

'Yes,' was the reply, 'I think that the laity ought to do all in their power at this time, both in respect to dilapidations and tithe. But that is a matter for each Diocesan Board. Pensions is rather a different thing. That is the personal concern of the incumbent. Tithe and dilapidations relate to the benefice.'

But the complaints of the clergy are not confined to their financial difficulties just now, and I went on to mention the question of status. Was it reasonable, for instance, to contend that the Ecclesiastical Duties Measure infringed the rights of the clergy?

'The clergy seem quite amazingly unaware,' Lord Hugh replied, 'that almost all of it has been law since the passing of the Benefices Act in 1898. They object to procedure by Commission. This began in 1838 with the Pluralities Act, which was then extended by another Pluralities Act, and then again by the Benefices Act, 1898, to deal with questions of negligence. What they complain of is that a man is tried by Commission instead of an ordinary Court, and that you have a Commission with its administrative methods trying a disciplinary issue. But that is the law now. The only difference that the new Act makes is that it rather extends the sphere and takes in certain cases of negligence which were not within the Acts before. That is all it does really; though it adds the clause to which personally I was opposed, but which the clergy insisted on having, that at the end of the five years' inhibition the living becomes vacant.'

'You know,' I interrupted, 'the objection that has

been made to the incumbent not necessarily being informed at once of the charge made against him?'

'Whatever that is worth, it has all been going on since 1898. What the critics really mean is that procedure by Commission is not suitable for trying a case of negligence. While the Measure was before the Assembly, the Assembly might have set up a new tribunal, and made a completely different Measure; but that was not done. As a matter of fact, the system has worked well enough in the past, though we have not got the negligent clergy out of their livings as much as we ought to have done. I have never yet heard of a case of a negligent clergyman being unfairly treated. This Measure covers rather a larger sphere of negligence than it did before, and adds the vacation of the living after five years. No one could doubt that the case was clearly put to the Assembly, and that the clergy in the Assembly were in favour of the Measure. And, as I say, procedure by Commission has applied to negligence since 1898.'

'Did you hear,' I asked, 'that a member of the House of Clergy was anxious to move in the Assembly that the Measure be not further considered in Parliament?'

'It is too late for that now. It has been reported to Parliament by the Ecclesiastical Committee, and any member of Parliament may move any day to approve it.'

'Do you think that the Measure will get through Parliament?'

'I should think so,' was the reply.

'Is there any possible way,' I asked further, 'in which we can make the actual provisions of the Measure more clear to some of the critics among the clergy?'

'I think the best thing,' Lord Hugh replied, 'would be to set out side by side the conditions obtaining under the Acts before the passing of the Ecclesiastical Duties Measure, and its new provisions.'

But there is another way in which, as some members have continually pleaded, the Assembly might be

helped to a fuller understanding of, and consequently a more careful vote on, Church Measures; and I asked whether it would not be an advantage if the Standing Committee were to meet earlier before each session, so that the full agenda could be in the hands of members a few weeks before the date on which the session begins.

'That is not very easy,' Lord Hugh replied. 'The Standing Committee referred the complaints about procedure to the Standing Orders Committee, and we considered the matter, and we are bringing in a report which we have framed. This includes a provision for Question Time. We also propose to make this Standing Order—That in respect to General Approval, and in respect to Revision on first return from committee, no decision shall be taken unless the Measure, in the form in which it has been submitted, has been in the hands of members for at least fourteen days. It will be open to discussion within the fourteen days, but not for decision. And I propose, in moving all this, to make a speech about the whole subject. But what I specially wish to emphasise is this—that it is perfectly easy to postpone a Measure, if desired, by asking that the debate be adjourned. A member need only get up and move the adjournment of the debate until the next day, or a day or two later, or until the next session. And if the member proposing the adjournment carries the Assembly with him, neither the officials nor the Members-in-Charge can stand in his way. I will go further, and say that a motion for postponement ought to be rather favourably looked upon by the Assembly. The request may often be a perfectly reasonable one, and members should be in favour of it rather than prejudiced against it, as further time for reflection is sometimes needed.'

It is not, however, only within the Assembly that its difficulties arise, and nobody is more qualified than Lord Hugh Cecil to speak of the relation of the Church Assembly to Parliament. My first question on this head

was whether the atmosphere in Parliament is as favourable now as at the time when the Enabling Act was passed.

'It is just possible,' was the reply, 'that recent agitation may have produced an effect on the House of Commons. I have noticed a slight change during the last six months.[1] But until that time I should have said that the House of Commons was entirely favourable to Church Measures, and very much opposed to any interference unless on purely secular grounds. There is no disposition in the House to overrule the Church Assembly on what is thought to be a matter of ecclesiastical concern. No one ever dreams of interfering unless he can show that the matter under discussion is one in which secular or lay interests are concerned.'

'Take, for instance,' I suggested, 'the City Churches Measure. What do you think will be the attitude of the House of Commons towards that?'

'It is impossible to say, but I should think it may quite probably be rejected. Personally, I think that it would be a foolish decision, but it would be taken, if at all, purely on artistic and archæological, and not on ecclesiastical grounds.'

'And what of the Ecclesiastical Duties Measure?'

'My impression is that there will be little difficulty, because, when it comes to be argued, the true purport of the Measure will be made clear. Members of Parliament are quite favourable to a Measure against real negligence.'

'Will the same apply, do you think, to Prayer-book revision?'

'I think the House of Commons will be extremely reluctant to interfere with the decision of the House of Bishops and the Church Assembly. But you never can quite tell what members may be driven to do by pressure from their constituents. You should also remember that the House is very unwilling to discuss such matters

[1] Written in November, 1926.

as the nature of the Eucharist. Such a subject would seem to them entirely unsuitable for public discussion. The discussion would seem profane. It is just possible that the strain of Prayer-book revision may imperil the Establishment; and if, in the last resort, the House of Commons is confronted with the necessity of discussing such a subject as the nature of the Eucharist by the pressure of the constituencies, a large number of members will say—" This is impossible, we cannot have a union of Church and State which entails such painful and unseemly discussions." '

I then asked Lord Hugh whether he thought it right for churchmen to organise opposition in Parliament to Measures which have received the approval of the Assembly.

' I would not say,' he replied, ' that you can lay down absolute rules, but I think people ought not to be self-assertive. You cannot say that people are never to work against the passing of a Measure, because they may say that they have conscientious reasons for doing so. The Assembly's opinion should carry great weight, and it is the duty of private individuals almost always to subordinate their own opinions to that of the Assembly.'

' Do you think,' I asked, ' that the House of Lords was justified in rejecting the Bishopric of Shrewsbury Measure ? '

' They certainly had a right to do so,' was the reply. ' But I do not think their judgment was sound. After all, the House of Lords gave only two hours' attention to the subject; and it does not fully understand any of the big issues from the standpoint of the Church. They had all the old discussions on the general controversy of big *v.* little bishoprics, which really had very little to do with the point. They had not looked into the problem of the Welsh border, and the other geographical difficulties.'

' What would be the best step for the Church Assembly to take in the matter ? '

'I think we ought to have another inquiry. I do not think you should treat Parliament—even if you think it has behaved foolishly—disrespectfully. Though I am all for opposing its views quite openly in public, I think for the Assembly it would be unseemly and would merely irritate, not to treat the decisions of Parliament with the greatest possible respect. It might, on a great issue, be wise to appeal to the country at large. But it is not worth while having a fight over a Bishopric Measure; it is better to have a new inquiry to see whether there is any other solution. Personally, I think the best scheme would be to take the Forest of Dean out of Gloucester, and put it into Hereford. Even after losing Shropshire, Hereford would be an unsatisfactory diocese, not because it would be small, but because it would be both small and homogeneous—entirely agricultural. If you have only agricultural parishes, and not very many of them, in a diocese, there is a certain danger of stagnation. But there is an industrial population geographically very conveniently situated, which might be brought in, and this would give variety and strength to the diocese.

'But I want to add this,' Lord Hugh continued. 'I think controversies about these matters, in or out of Parliament, are by no means altogether undesirable. It is perhaps unpleasant to see the Church Assembly attacked and occasionally suffering a little unpopularity; but on the whole it is not a bad sign. It shows that the Assembly counts, and people will learn to pay attention to it, and take an interest in it.'

We passed on to discuss the lack of interest shown in these controversies and in parochial church councils by the average lay churchman, and I asked Lord Hugh whether he could suggest any way by which the interest of the laity could be increased.

'Only by giving the councils more power,' he replied. 'And that raises difficult questions. But I have always held—I expect you would not agree with me in this—

that it was a fundamental mistake to make the incumbent chairman of the parochial church council. I wanted the clergyman to come as often as he liked, like the King to Parliament, and to take part. I did not want him to be chairman because I wanted to have a lay chairman who would feel that it was a laymen's show and that they had to be responsible for running it.'

'Do you think,' I asked further, 'that both clergy and laity are rather bewildered by the rate of progress that the Assembly has made, and that there is a danger of legislation getting far ahead of administration?'

'Not quite that. I think it is more the danger of its getting ahead of public opinion—which is quite as bad. But it may be that the Church Assembly is a little demoralised by the experience of its members in bodies like diocesan conferences, which have power to discuss, and little else. It is important that members should take their legislative duties very seriously.'

'But you know the feeling of many private members, that they have little opportunity of speaking, and that they are very shy of doing so?'

'Yes,' was the reply. 'But the difficulty here is partly the room. The Hall of the Church House is a bad place to meet in. I have always wanted to meet at St. John's Church, Westminster. You could screen off the sanctuary for the week of the Assembly. The Archbishop would be at the West end and face East, surrounded by a circle of bishops, with the clergy on his right and the laity on his left, and the officials below the Chair. The clergy and laity would be banked up on each side, facing one another. Members could then speak, if they liked, from their places, unless they were going to make an elaborate speech. Those who wanted to make a long speech could go to the tribune; but a brief speech could be made without moving. Everybody would feel much more at ease, and all places would be equally good. There would be plenty of room; and a great many shy people would be willing to get up and

say a few words from their places, though they might not want to come up to a platform.'

There will always, I suppose, be two particular angles from which the work of the Assembly is regarded. The main interest of those who are at the centre of administrative activity is to see that the machine works ; the concern of those at the circumference is primarily with the effect produced by the working of the machinery on their own individual lives and difficulties. The contrast is a rough one, and it is less noticeable in the Church Assembly than in many other administrative bodies ; but it is accurate enough to denote the particular danger that lies ahead of the Assembly in the near future. The health and strength of that body must depend on the extent to which it retains the confidence of the Church, and on the willingness of those who represent the two outlooks to make every allowance for one another's point of view. Some of those who wish to help have suggested the possibility of a ' prayer-card ' for the work of the Assembly. Modern collects and prayers are woefully jejune, as a rule, nor would it be easy to write a prayer of which the main petition would be that those who are at the centre of administration may be continually mindful of the peculiar difficulties of the men whose daily lives are touched at every point by the decisions of the Assembly ; and that the constituents who send their representatives to the Church House may not forget that it is by these representatives, and not by some unsympathetic clique, that those decisions are made. It is, at any rate, this spirit that is needed to-day. And I hope it is not an impertinence to add that no member of the Assembly is working harder for the growth of that spirit than Lord Hugh Cecil ; nor is there anyone to whom the Assembly looks with greater respect and confidence, as showing to a rare degree the sympathy by which alone the fusion of the two outlooks can be achieved.

THE REV. PREBENDARY WILSON CARLILE

Wilson Carlile, Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral, Honorary Doctor of Divinity, Companion of Honour, and founder of the Church Army, is eighty-one years of age. The activities of the Church Army before, during and since the war are familiar to many besides church-people; and when I called at the Headquarters of the Army, it was to get a glimpse of something even more interesting than the organisation itself—the personality and the life story of its founder: of the man who started on a business career in a well-established firm in Cheapside; who had set his heart on making £20,000 (and made it) before he was five-and-twenty; who read Mackay's 'Grace and Truth' in his twenty-seventh year, and thereafter offered his life to God; whose open-air meetings, when he was a curate in Kensington, had to be abandoned because they interfered with the traffic; who tackled the slums of Westminster when there were no fouler rookeries in London than under the shadow of the Abbey; who preached night after night in the streets, his coat ripped to pieces by the crowd, his face bleeding and disfigured with the yolk of eggs, red ochre and pitch; who, with a bodyguard of a few stalwarts, had many a fight to retain the processional banner of the Church Army, for every square inch of which a local publican had offered a pot of beer; and who, on Whitsun Monday, 1883, was followed by his Westminster enemies into Battersea Park where he was to hold a meeting, was assaulted, knocked down and kicked almost to death as he lay unconscious on the ground. (Think of all this, some of you C.E.M.S. members, if ever you feel ashamed of being seen in the streets at an open-air service!) Not

the least valuable of Dr. Carlile's treasures must be a letter written from prison by the ringleader of his enemies—a man who had more than once wounded him, and had gone to Battersea Park on that Whitsun Monday (as he boasted) to 'finish' him, and was only prevented from doing so by being arrested: 'Dear Sir,—I write these few lines hoping to find you *in better health than I last saw you.*' (Surely, even in his acute bodily pain—he lay on his back for nearly six months as a result of this assault—Dr. Carlile's sense of humour came to his relief as he read these opening words!) 'I humbly beg your pardon for having assaulted you or any of your people on Whitmonday. . . . I hope when I come out I shall be one of your followers.—Your loving friend, ——.' It is a far cry from Pentonville to the Middle West; but the writer was last heard of doing mission work in Chicago.

The first thing I noticed about the Church Army Headquarters was that everybody was smiling. The aged retainer who opened the door of No. 59 smiled when he told me that I had come to the wrong entrance, and asked me to ring the bell next door. As I was on my way to No. 57, I met another Church Army worker, who smiled as he took me to No. 61—there are a great many entrances to the Headquarters buildings. Miss Carlile was smiling as she opened the door to me; and if I record little of the women's work done by the Army, it is only for lack of space in which to tell the story; but I understood something of the influence that must flow out from the grace and gentle strength of the leader at No. 61. To say that Dr. Carlile himself was smiling would be quite inadequate. He was beaming, and he beamed for two hours without a cloud crossing his face. When one wishes to be complimentary about an octogenarian, the usual formula is that 'though a little hard of hearing, his energies remain unimpaired, and he still takes an intelligent interest in current affairs.'

This is not often true; but it is considerably less than the truth about the head of the Church Army. His talk through lunch was all of 'current affairs.' What was my opinion of the Charleston? Was it wise to have dancing at parochial gatherings? Could the Church hold the young people without it? What did I think of the new movement for 'community singing'? Ought not the Church to take it up, and use her cathedrals for it? And it was not till lunch was over, when I gently reminded Dr. Carlile that I had come not to be questioned but to question, that he gave way, and consented to tell me something of the early days of the Church Army.

'How did it all begin? Well, my own religious history is a curious one. I was a Plymouth Brother. They have no worship, as you know, except the breaking of bread—in the morning we broke bread, and in the evening we went for the outsiders. They drove me out because I went to Communion with my father, who had not been confirmed, at an Anglican church—the vicar never asked my father whether he had been confirmed or not.'

The early days of many movements in Church history are not without interest. But surely a stranger foundation was never laid for one of the most striking of them all, than in the receiving of Holy Communion by an unconfirmed Congregationalist side by side with a Plymouth Brother? How different might have been the result for the Church if the vicar had 'fenced the tables' against these two dissenters!

'When first I was ordained,' Dr. Carlile went on, 'I was Carr Glyn's curate in Kensington'—Wilson Carlile at St. Mary Abbots; it seems about as appropriate as for Billy Sunday to be Master of the Temple! 'On Sunday mornings he had the church full, and in the evenings I had it empty. That wouldn't do at all; so every night, at nine o'clock, I preached in the streets and, when I got tired, I put up someone else—a groom,

a valet, anybody who had a love for Christ and his fellow-men—and I gave him two minutes. That type of preacher draws for two minutes, and bores in four. So I kept him to two, and then somebody else had another two, and so on. (They were all live wires; but all the life went out of them after two minutes.) And then I realised that the witness of the layman tells more than the witness of the cleric. And that was the beginning of the Church Army.'

The official Church was at first, I gathered, neither kindly nor hostile. The Bishop of Oxford (Mackarness) was friendly; but, 'for the most part, they gave us the cold shoulder,' said Dr. Carlile. 'We had half a dozen of our men trained, and knocked at one vicarage door after another, where we were told we were not wanted, even if we found the money to keep them. We had, too, a little disagreement at the start. My old friend Webster, of All Souls', Langham Place, told me we should have to have a High Church Army and a Low Church Army; but I couldn't agree to that. And now, except for the extremes at both ends, our evangelists are welcomed everywhere in working-class parishes.'

'You confine your work, then, to the poor?'

'Yes, and we take care that the training we give does not unfit our evangelists for that work. We want them to know about men and not books. A theological college would disqualify them for their work at once.'

'But what of your men who have been ordained?'

'Ah, that's different. They, of course, have to be trained in theology, at a general or diocesan training college—six hundred and fifty of our captains have been ordained. But I don't want men to be spoiled by theology. If a man can convert blackguards, ordain him, but still use him for converting blackguards. If you give him a long enough course of theology, the "kick" will go out of him sooner or later. It's only

a question of time. And, for those who are not ordained, the Bible and the Prayer-book are enough.'

'Have you ever had,' I asked, 'any difficulty in finding evangelists?'

'Not the slightest; though we could always do with more. Hundreds of Primitive Methodist local preachers have applied to be admitted. They wanted Evangelism instead of Chapelism. They wanted to be Revival Boys, and not merely teachers. But we have never learned to use the laity in our Church. You remember that old General Booth used to say that the bulk of his best men came from the Church of England.'

The mention of revivalism led us to talk of the genuineness of 'sudden conversions,' of which a good deal has lately been said and written; and I was not surprised to hear that Dr. Carlile believed wholeheartedly in such conversions.

'How could I disbelieve in them,' he asked, 'when I have seen them time after time with my own eyes? One of our very best captains first came to church so drunk that it took two men to hold him down in his seat. He was naturally a bit noisy, and the congregation shouted, "Turn him out." I said, "No! *You* turn out, and walk up and down outside and pray for him." But they wouldn't go, not they; they wanted to stay and see the fun. And that man was a gaol-bird. He never would have been a Christian if he hadn't been to prison. The Devil's a fool, really: he holds on to his men a bit too tight sometimes, and they break away—thank God.'

In answer to a question about the number of his workers, Dr. Carlile told me that there were about a thousand Church Army evangelists—for whom, I understand, provision is made in their old age—one-half of whom are women. Of the men, about one-half are itinerant, the remainder having settled work in parishes. They have a simple rule of life, which includes entire

abstinence from tobacco and alcoholic drinks; and the strictest observance of these rules is required. 'One cigarette,' said Dr. Carlile, 'is an act of resignation. You look surprised at that; but the example of sacrifice has a lot to do with winning others, and if a rough customer sees that a man has given up beer and tobacco to save him, it gains his respect at once. But don't think that smoking or drinking is the greatest enemy of our workers. What I fear more than anything for them is respectability. That is the most deteriorating influence for our evangelists that I know. And the rules are not so strict for "soldiers" in the Army as for officers. They have a threefold rule—to be a communicant, a teetotaler, and a witness. Don't forget that last word. That's how we win the worst of all.'

'Do you find,' I asked, 'that those whom you call the worst take easily to the Church services?'

'They love the Holy Communion,' was the reply, 'and simple mission services; but I am not quite so sure about Mattins and Evensong. I am afraid that some of the old boozers are a bit shaky on Mattins; but you can't expect them to be enthusiastic about a service that was intended chiefly to keep monks and nuns out of mischief.'

I had heard something of the week-end parties at Bryanston Street, in which university undergraduates and working-men evangelists are mixed up together with the happiest results.

'Of course, we try to cast our nets as widely as possible,' explained Dr. Carlile, 'and these parties are always a great success. The men come at one o'clock on Saturday, and stay till nine o'clock on Monday morning; and the effect the meetings have on everybody is to make them less self-conscious about their religion. I have seen some of the undergraduates not able to say "bo to a goose" when they first came—they had probably never even taken a Sunday School class in their lives—but we set them all round the table with our

fellows and make them talk to each other about their religion, what their mothers taught them, how they came to be interested in religion, and so on ; and at the end of the time they're as thick as thieves ; they all feel like brothers, and everybody has picked up something from everybody else. But that's only because we make them *all* talk about religion. Remember the words " if all prophesy " of St. Paul.'

But the Church Army cares for the bodies of men as well as their souls, and we went on to talk of the social work of the Church Army, and in particular of its new housing scheme, which has already achieved considerable success. I asked Dr. Carlile whether he was satisfied with the response to the appeal.

' Well,' he replied, ' we have received £60,000—most of it given, but about ten per cent. of it lent at two and a half per cent. interest. This has meant that we have been able to erect a hundred and seventy houses ; some of these are now being built, others are finished and occupied. We reserve them for the ex-Service men, and choose out the very poor. They pay from seven and sixpence to eight shillings a week rent, plus rates, and we could do ten times more if we had ten times as much money. Only this week we moved into one of our houses an ex-soldier with a wife and seven children, from a single underground back-kitchen in Hoxton into which the light of day never came ; and the man said that it was like moving out of hell into heaven.'

' And are you successful with your emigration schemes ? '

' We can't do as much there as we should like. It is difficult to get people to leave this country. Yet we do everything for them, seeing them comfortably off here, and with local committees to look after them at the other end—in Winnipeg we have our own hostel. But the younger ones are prevented by their parents from going. The boys come here and ask whether they'll get

the dole in the new country, and a dozen other questions put up to them by their parents. Still, we have managed to help about a thousand a year to emigrate, and the accounts we have of them afterwards are mostly excellent.'

We spoke next of the prospects of a revival of religion in England. Dr. Carlile described 1926 as a year of greater receptiveness all round; 'the coming years may be even better, but only on one condition.'

'And that is . . . ?'

'That the revival comes from the pew as well as the pulpit. We have got to tell the laity, and tell them again and again, that they are the Church, and that a revival can only come through them. Did you ever hear of any kind of warfare outside Bedlam in which the soldiers stood around at the base, and let the officers go up to the firing-line alone? Yet this is what our Church is continually trying to do. And if the laity are not told, they will never learn.'

'But how would you set about it?'

'We have got to make the laity bear their witness. And I mean this quite literally in the old evangelical sense. I should start by making them bear witness in church. If they won't do it there, they won't do it anywhere. Men will bear open witness to Baldwin and Cook: why should they not do so to Jesus Christ? Let me explain. I should take some sentence such as "I know that my Redeemer liveth," and ask the congregation to stand up and say it aloud. Some would, and others wouldn't. I should then tell those who were still sitting to stay where they were and ask the rest of the congregation to pray for them. Soon they would all be on their feet, saying the sentence aloud together; and then they would go outside to bear witness to what they had said inside the church. If a bishop came to a church, I should ask the congregation one by one to come up to the altar and bear their witness before him.

I know that all this sounds very odd and very old-fashioned, but if the clergy had more love for their people, they could easily persuade them. To-day it is nothing but conferences and committees and quiet days. We can't get along on them alone. Anyhow, I am eighty years old, and I want to start a new campaign of evangelisation and witness—isn't this what the appeal of the World Call demands ? '

My last question was inevitable. Looking back over a long ministry, how did Dr. Carlile compare the spiritual state of the country with what it was half a century and more ago ?

' I am a confirmed optimist,' was the reply. ' I feel more hopeful now than when I began my ministry. The whole tone of the country is higher. Listen to the conversation in the smoke-room of a commercial hotel, ask about the talk in public schools, or look at the condition of our streets—everywhere there is improvement to be seen. It may be true that people don't go to church as much as they did. But perhaps that shows their good taste ; they go fast enough where they are likely to get some good from the service and the sermon. Yes ! I shall be an optimist to the end.'

It takes all sorts to make a Church ; and, whatever we may have reason to be ashamed of in the Church of England, of one thing at least we can be proud—that ' all sorts ' can still find work to do within her fold. The Church Army workers have now their assured place in hundreds of parishes ; and Dr. Carlile—if he ever has time, which I doubt, to look back to the beginnings of his work—must rejoice that from his early fights in the slums of Westminster there has risen a great organisation, which will be his munificent legacy to the Church to which he has given his life. Of that organisation the Prime Minister, speaking in the Queen's Hall, once said words that will never be forgotten in Bryanston Street ; and his tribute was an echo of a sentence from one of

Dr. Lightfoot's charges to the clergy of the Durham Diocese, when the Church Army was in its infancy, long ago: 'It has dragged numbers of men and women out of the gutter, has expelled the demon drink or some other gross vice, and has seated them clothed and in their right mind at the feet of Christ.'

DR. JOSEPH WELLS

Was any reader of these pages present, I wonder, in the Hall of Wadham College about eight or nine and twenty years ago, when one of Dr. Wells' lectures on Herodotus was interrupted by an incident that gave as much amusement to his hearers as it must have caused embarrassment to the lecturer? If there were, they will not have forgotten how the door of the Hall suddenly opened and two women stepped in, with guide-books in their hands. Slowly they walked round the walls, pausing in front of one picture after another, and passing audible comments on the merits of each. It is in no way derogatory to the interest of the lecture to record that our attention was at once riveted on the invaders, and that we waited, not without a rather fiendish joy, for the situation to develop. Dr. Wells was equal to it; he courteously mentioned to the visitors that he was engaged in lecturing, and would they please postpone their tour of inspection till the hour was over? Without a touch of self-consciousness they assured him that neither he nor we were interrupting their pleasure, and that they were quite content that the Hall should not be entirely unoccupied during their visit. It was then pointed out to them that the Hall was a private room—and we could hear no more of the conversation. But the lecturer's tact triumphed; after a moment or two they left with as much sangfroid as they had entered, and our work was resumed. If I could remember the exact date, I would send for a copy of the *Isis* of the following week, in which the incident was immortalised in verse. One would think that it was not easy to find a rhyme for the Greek historian, but I remember—among other lines

of the poem—that the visitors entered 'without a nod at us,' which struck us then as a marvel of versification. And when I reminded Dr. Wells, a short time ago, of the incident—which he had not forgotten—he suggested as the author of the poem one who now holds an important post in the service of the State, and who has since become so distinguished that I might find myself involved in a libel action, were I to quote it as one of his earliest literary efforts.

Before that day, and long after, the fortunes of Wadham were watched over by Dr. Joseph Wells; and his career has included the tenure of the Vice-Chancellorship with distinction and grace—which ended more than a year ago with the Latin Oration that will not be forgotten by those who heard or read it. He has seen many undergraduates come and go, and it fell to him, as to other Heads of colleges, to 'implement,' if the word may for once be allowed, the findings of the Royal Commission which were approved by the King in Council in April, 1926. And I was assured by more than one person that none could give me a more accurate summary of the most important findings of the Commission than the Warden of Wadham, nor pass a wiser judgment on its probable effect on the life of the colleges and the university.

In October of this year,[1] I understood from Dr. Wells, the new system for administering scholarships will begin; and by now all the colleges have revised their statutes to bring them into line with the regulations of the Commission. What would be the results, I asked, of this and other regulations on the old system as we had known it? Would there be any important changes? It was generally held, I knew, that the Report of the Commission was neither so alarming as was feared by the reactionaries, nor so drastic as was hoped by the most ardent of the reformers; and Dr. Wells agreed.

[1] Written in 1927.

'On the whole,' he said, 'I consider that the Commission has given us much less trouble than it might have given. But you would like me, I expect, to explain one or two points, which (I think) are not as fully understood, outside the university, as they should be. First, about the new system of scholarships. You remember the old method; a man received £80, or whatever it might be, a year, without any inquiry as to his parents' private means: if he was worth his scholarship, the whole of it was awarded to him. That will be changed in October; and a certain number of graduates view with considerable suspicion the new regulation, as making the scholarships eleemosynary. It will work out in this way. Each elected scholar will receive £30 a year, or the equivalent in rooms free of rent, rates and taxes; a form will then be sent to his parents, asking whether they wish their son to have further help. This will, normally, only be given when the parents' lack of means justifies it; and questions will, of necessity, be asked as to the income of the father and mother, in order to show that a further grant is really needed. You can imagine that this plan is not smiled on by some college authorities. I have heard quoted the somewhat sweeping statement of a schoolmaster that "it is impossible to get the truth out of parents"; and, further, objections are raised that we are destroying the character of a scholarship for the sake of its pecuniary benefit—in a word, that we are endowing poverty instead of brains.'

'Would you say,' I asked, 'that there was much substance in these objections?'

'I can explain my own views,' the Warden replied, 'in a few sentences. First, the inquiry will not be so inquisitorial as it is sometimes made to appear; it must be remembered that no questions will be asked about a boy's means or his parents' till he has been elected to a scholarship. Secondly, the system will be administered by the colleges, which will ensure a personal and sympathetic inquiry into each separate case. Thirdly, I have

seen the system at work in the Government State scholarships for some years, and I feel sure that substantial justice is done. Perhaps an over-conscientious parent may occasionally do himself and his boy an injustice; but on the whole I believe it will work. The honour of the scholarship will be the same as hitherto, and in addition there will be fresh opportunities for those who have little or no means of their own. Everyone will know that there will be a good prize for brains, and the bulk of the money will go to those who need it.'

'Do I understand, then, that there will be no honorary scholarships in future?'

'No. There is just that drawback, I admit, that a boy of wealthy parents will have to take the £30, which otherwise he might not have claimed, as honorary scholarships are now forbidden in all the college statutes.'

'Do you regard this,' I asked, 'as the most sweeping change effected by the Commission?'

'Not quite,' was the answer. 'More important, in my judgment, is the regulation by which, out of the Government grant of £85,000 a year, £10,000 is to be set aside for assistance to college tutors. This should raise the level of learning and teaching in the university. You know what happened too often under the old system. Fellows of colleges were never too well paid; and often—this was specially true of young married tutors—they were obliged to take up examination and coaching work, spending in this way valuable time that would have been better devoted to increasing their knowledge and to publishing the results. For some at least of them, this will now be changed. Grants, varying from £100 to £250, will be made to college tutors on the recommendation of a special Board elected by the teachers in each Faculty. Those who receive them will not be expected to discontinue their ordinary tutorial work in college; and, on the other hand, they will not be required necessarily to give extra lectures. Probably one in four of the teaching staff of the colleges will be

helped from time to time. The greater leisure thus secured for research and literary work should prove of much value to the university.'

It was inevitable that the Commission should recommend a measure of centralisation, and that to a certain extent the independence of the colleges should be curtailed. But I gathered from Dr. Wells that these changes are not serious. The new system of assessing the contributions of the colleges to the university chest will probably not result in any increase in the total amount paid; some colleges think they will now have to pay more, but the object of the change is merely to make the several payments more equitable.

Further, the Board of each Faculty will decide which of the college lecturers are to be placed on the university list, and so recognised as university lecturers—the interest of this regulation lies in the fact that colleges will no longer be able to appoint as a Fellow a man whom they wish to make a 'dean,' or some other official elected simply on account of his disciplinary abilities. Oxford men of more than one generation will remember famous 'chuckers-out,' who were appointed 'more for brawn than for brain,' when the tone of a college needed raising. In future such an official will be an expensive luxury, and may cost the college a fine of £150 a year for the benefit of the Common Fund of the university. The colleges, moreover, will no longer be able to decide the retiring age of their Fellows, which is fixed by their statutes.

'For the last year or so,' said Dr. Wells, 'an appreciable part of the £85,000 allowed to us by the State has gone towards pensions; all the servants of the university, from porters to professors, will in future be included in a pension scheme, and a considerable number of those already in office have put themselves voluntarily under it. This became necessary when a retiring age for professors was fixed at seventy. Now Heads of colleges are obliged to retire at seventy, with a possible extension to seventy-

five, and all tutors at sixty, with a possible extension to sixty-five. There is, of course, a danger that under this system a man still intellectually alert may be left without any definite work; but such a man would be likely to find other work to his hand if he wanted it; and, on the whole, I am in favour of the age of compulsory retirement. I might say here,' the Warden added with a smile, 'that I intend to practise what I preach, and that I hope to retire myself after the summer.'

We touched on several other regulations laid down by the Commission; but I was anxious to hear Dr. Wells' views of the undergraduate of to-day, as he looked back on those he had known in past years. Were the men working as much—or as little—as they used to? Which were the Final Schools most in favour? Was living as expensive now for the undergraduate as rumour made it? And were we ever going to win another rugger match or a boat-race?

In the first place, no freshman is now allowed to come up, I learned, unless he has passed Responsions. I confess to a certain æsthetic regret at this regulation. There used to be one or two hostels, which it would be invidious to name, where were harboured men who came to Oxford for advantages other than educational and, either for lack of ability or of intention, had no chance of satisfying even the most charitable of examiners; indefinite-looking creatures, as some of us remember them, who wandered ceaselessly up and down the streets in garish waistcoats, often accompanied by large dogs, and spent their time in sampling curious cigarettes packed in attractive boxes —which the experienced tobacconist hoped would reconcile his customers to allowing him a margin of 100 per cent. profit—and meerschaum pipes which, the purchaser was instructed, should be held in the gloved hand when in use, if they were to reach their full beauty and maturity. *Eheu fugaces!* Are they still bought and sold, I wonder, in the High and the Turl?

But the change to a compulsory entrance examination, Dr. Wells pointed out, will make little real difference. 'For some years past,' he said, 'it has been very rare for men to come into residence who have not passed Responsions. No college wants stupid men. Of course there were, and still will be, dispensations—for men, for instance, who have been educated abroad, and for working-class students who have attended tutorial classes. The only difference will be that these will now be dealt with by a central committee instead of by the colleges; the proceedings will be less intelligent and less elastic.'

In regard to the Final Schools, I learned that there is still a boom in Modern History—this bears out, by the way, Dr. Cyril Norwood's statement that the great rival of Classics to-day in the public schools is not science, but history. The number of those who take 'Greats' does not vary much. Theology is recovering a little, and if there are fewer men reading for it than there were twenty years back, there are more than there were six or seven years ago. The entries for the Law Finals have risen considerably, and we are to look forward to a larger number of Oxford men in the lower, as well as the higher, branch of the legal profession.

As to the amount of work done, I gathered that there is not much change. 'There may be some truth,' the Warden admitted, 'in the contention that immediately after the war undergraduates were more industrious; but to the men who came up then it was everything to get through their course as quickly as they could. Otherwise, the idle are about as idle, and the studious about as studious, as they were before the war. But one thing has made a very real difference—both to work and to games—and that is the increasing popularity of the motor. Men can get further afield; and that is one reason, I think—if you would like me to speak of athletics—why they are slightly less disposed than they were, twenty years ago, to take part in college games.

The motor has given a considerable impetus to golf and, for the last two years, Frilford golf links has paid a dividend.' (Happy Frilford shareholders, I reflected, and happy golfers—as I remembered the mud at Cowley through which we used to punch our way with a cleek, our only hope of excitement being the very childish one of being able to drive into an unpopular don !)

'But they have golf-links and motors at Cambridge too?' I suggested, with the rugger match and the boat-race in mind.

'True; but I am not laying our recent defeats entirely at the door of the motor. There are, however, two considerations to be borne in mind—first, the Cambridge Pass degree is said to be easier than ours, and therefore the man who intends to devote most of his time to athletics is more likely to go to Cambridge; and second, the number of men in residence there is larger than at Oxford. Further, we are continually being reminded of the athletic prowess of our Rhodes scholars; but you will see that this cuts both ways. The American athlete for instance, may go to Cambridge, as he knows that there will be fewer of his own countrymen to compete with there than here; and the English public school athlete may well think his chance of a "Blue" is better where there are no Rhodes scholars.'

I next asked Dr. Wells about the cost of living for an undergraduate to-day.

'Of course, it is greater than it was before the war,' he replied, 'though in my college we have not raised the rent of our rooms, and the college dues are only a very little higher. The official estimate of the cost of living is about £225 a year, for a man who has a home to which he can go in the vacations. Some colleges, as you know, have always been more expensive than others; but I should say that an undergraduate to-day may without difficulty keep his Oxford expenditure at about £250, and that he certainly need not go beyond £300.'

'And what proportion of men is now coming from the larger public schools?'

'It is difficult to say exactly—you could find the figures in the official returns—but the pressure to secure entry is very great in every college.'

'To what do you attribute that?' I asked.

'I think there are three reasons which contribute. Many more men are now coming to Oxford "officially" —the Government, for instance, sends men to be trained for the minor colonial services. There are also more foreigners. An increasing number of Americans is applying for admission, and—though this is a much smaller number—more men every year come from the Continent of Europe: the Hungarian Government, for instance, is now sending four or five every year. And, lastly, there is the steady increase in the number of good secondary schools throughout the country. Every County Council has now one or more official secondary school; and if a boy can gain an Oxford scholarship, he can generally get further help from the County Council, and perhaps a leaving Exhibition from his school; with these three, he can afford to come up. Twenty years ago the County Councils spent practically nothing on secondary schools; now they are spending tens of thousands a year on them, and they are liberal in grants for promising scholars to go to Oxford or Cambridge.'

My next question was of the women students. Had the Commission made any difference to their status or number?

'The number,' Dr. Wells replied, 'has much increased. The Commission decided that it was outside its powers to limit the numbers, but the whole matter may soon receive careful attention by the university authorities. It is a much more burning question here than at Cambridge. There they only have five hundred women students, all of them resident in colleges. Here we have over five hundred in the colleges, and rather

more than two hundred home students, as against 3500 to 4000 men.'

We went on to talk of the careers that are most popular with Oxford men to-day. Three years ago, I remember, there was a fairly general feeling—justified by the statistics—that university men were holding back from the colonial services; especially from the I.C.S., largely owing to the number of natives admitted to the service. That feeling, Dr. Wells thinks, has now to a great extent disappeared. 'Men are recognising the great possibilities of a career of service in India, and the figures of successful candidates from the universities last year were almost as good as in the years before the war. East and West Africa also absorb many of our men, and eight or ten graduates a year enter the Sudanese Civil Service from Oxford and Cambridge. Schoolmastering, again, is now looked upon by more men in the light of a vocation as well as a profession; and, though hardly any of them become elementary school teachers, there is a whole new field opening up on the staffs of the secondary schools of which I spoke just now. The pay is as good as at an average public school; a pension is attached; and a good man always has a chance of a headmastership. With regard to the value of a university career as a preparation for business, I don't think too much attention need be paid to the recent remarks of Mr. Morris. Big men in business have not taken that line at all of late years, and in 1925 the Oxford Appointments Committee placed a hundred men in business posts.'

I then asked whether an increasing number of men seemed inclined to take Holy Orders.

'I should say,' the Warden answered, 'that there is a slight rise in the number. But of one thing I am sure, so far as my own experience goes; there is an undoubted improvement in the intellectual quality of men who are hoping to be ordained; and the old tradition which

prevailed when I was an undergraduate, that Holy Orders was a profession like any other, and that a man might take Orders without any special vocation, has almost entirely disappeared.'

This led me to inquire of the state of religious belief and practice in the university.

'I must guard myself against generalising about that,' was the reply. 'But on one or two points I can speak. I do not think that there are as many notable personalities among the clergy in Oxford as there were. This is not unimportant, in considering the religious influences at work. Again, there is no doubt that there is a general tendency among the undergraduates to hold aloof from institutional religion. I can't explain it; but it is there, and must be taken into account. On the other hand, the Student Christian Movement has lately gained in strength, with its study circles, conferences and so on. Our chapel services are very poorly attended—perhaps an average of two to three at daily Mattins—though it is noticeable that the average number at the weekday celebrations of Holy Communion is slightly larger than this. These celebrations are certainly attended better than formerly, and the number of communicants on Sunday is decidedly larger than it used to be. The sung Eucharist at St. Mary's, at noon every Sunday, is attended on the average by quite 100 students.'

'And what of the political views of the undergraduates?'

'Labour, I should say, has grown in strength. It is still, of course, in a minority; but at the Union debates this growth is obvious—though I would not suggest that the Union debaters were typical of the average undergraduate.'

My last question was prompted by reading of a scene that had occurred in a railway carriage, when a party of undergraduates was reported, in the newspapers, to

have wrecked a saloon coach somewhere between Oxford and Cambridge.

'That kind of incident,' the Warden said, 'is, of course, regrettable and disgraceful; and you may have noticed that one of the undergraduate papers was the first to express its strong disapproval. But the whole story was exaggerated in the Press, and the total damage amounted to thirty pounds—for which, after all, you can't do much damage! Such incidents, moreover, are much less common than they used to be—in fact that kind of ragging has almost entirely disappeared—and it would be utterly unfair to regard such behaviour as characteristic of the undergraduate of to-day.'

Plus ça change . . . But no; I will resist every temptation. My scrannel pipe would be more feeble than any, because I once collected all the glories of prose and poem that I could lay my hands on, of that loveliest of cities. Others may have their favourites—

'And that sweet city with her dreaming spires,
She needs not June for beauty's heightening!'

Or the bells of Oxford,

'The beads upon our rosary of immemorial song'—

and there are many worse lines than that in the *best* English poetry. But I end with the one I love most—even though its last line be a homily that none but the saint or the poet can obey:

'Know you her secret none can utter?
Hers of the Book, the tripled Crown?
Still on the spire the pigeons flutter,
Still by the gateway flits the gown;
Still on the street, from corbel and gutter,
Faces of stone look down.

'Still on her spire the pigeons hover,
Still by her gateway haunts the gown;
Ah, but her secret? You, young lover,
Drumming her old ones forth from town,
Know you the secret none discover?
Tell it—when *you* go down.'

THE RIGHT REVEREND ERNEST BARNES, BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM

THERE is no living bishop of the Church of England who has received a larger share of public notice than Dr. Barnes. He was the first bishop to be appointed by a Labour Prime Minister; and it is no disrespect to his abilities to conclude that he was selected because, of the three prominent clergymen who have consistently supported the Labour movement—two of them for a longer term of years than Dr. Barnes—he was by far the most capable and distinguished. Of the bishop's attitude to the clergy and laity in his diocese, there are just two things to be said. First, he is a man with a mission; he would be the Erasmus of our day. It is no use to reply that his mission is unnecessary or wrong-headed: the meanest prophet was never silenced by such a retort. Dr. Barnes sees what others see and lament, that a large number of intelligent and learned men are taking no active part in organised religion; and he is determined—as was Erasmus before him, when he watched the new learning in Europe steering a course away from the main stream of religious thought—that, in the triumphant progress of the renascence which he sees breaking through the test-tube and the ether, religion shall not be left behind.

The second point is that Dr. Barnes's erudition takes a form unusual in clergymen. He is mathematician first; scientist—some distance behind—second; and theologian, a rather inadequate third. Now you cannot refute mysticism with the multiplication table; and it neither improves the tempers nor alters the convictions of sacramentalists to liken them to the heathen. As Wynwood

Reade pointed out long ago, if you scoff at the religion of a savage, he merely regards you as a stranger unacquainted with the habits of his country. So it is that, inasmuch as the interests of his clergy lie in exactly the reverse order from his own—theology first and foremost, science very little, and mathematics not at all—Dr. Barnes finds it difficult to think along their lines, or even to speak their language.

And that word is suggestive, for the bishop's language is really more than half the trouble. Several times, after reading one of his sermons or addresses, I have thought of Albert Chevalier's old song—'It's not exactly what 'e says, it's the nasty way 'e says it.' I have seen outbursts from critics who object to some statement of the bishop to which a parallel could be found even in the now antiquated 'Essays and Reviews'; and there must be thousands of members of the Church of England holding the receptionist view of the Sacrament of Holy Communion, who would find themselves, theologically, in Dr. Barnes's company. But, in thinking of him as a bishop, it must be added with emphasis that the influence he is likely to exert in the future will depend largely on the tone he adopts in controversy, and on whether he will be careful to tread more lightly on the susceptibilities of those whom he is trying to convert.

I hold in happy memory the kindly courtesy with which the bishop and his wife received me at their delightful home at Harborne. And, as he swayed gently in a rocking-chair in his study, Dr. Barnes opened his mind to me with his usual frankness.

Our talk began with the teaching and worship of the Church, and I asked the bishop his opinion of the Church Catechism.

He protested gently: 'Is not the Gospel of more importance than the Catechism and is not the Spirit of Christ inclusive of sacramental grace?' Then, yielding to my enquiry, he said, 'The Catechism should be

re-written. It is not a good instrument of education.' I asked whether he had any objection to the questions and answers which define sacramental doctrine. 'The outlook,' he answered, 'naturally is attractive to an Englishman who can smile affectionately alike at logic and at the Church of England. Compare the delightful statement that the sacraments are "generally necessary to salvation" with the precision of Latin dogmatism.'

There was a pause, and he continued: 'Of course, critical enquiry has, since the Catechism was composed, enlarged knowledge. We can no longer assert with the old certainty that Baptism and the Lord's Supper were "ordained by Christ Himself." To-day we should say more guardedly that they were "given to us by the Spirit of Christ." It remains a certainty that our Lord was baptised by John the Baptist at the beginning of His ministry. It may possibly be true that His disciples baptised with His consent. But did He Himself baptise or order His disciples to use the Sacrament? A doubt remains. Baptism, according to the early chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, was "in the name of Jesus." Yet, in the often quoted command which occurs at the end of the First Gospel, there is a formula which invokes the Trinity; and its very form shows a developed theology which compels us to think that the writer was inferring a command of Christ from an ecclesiastical custom of his time. . . . So also with regard to the Last Supper; the crucial words "Do this in remembrance of me" are not to be found in the true text of any gospel. They are, as Westcott and Hort demonstrated, an interpolation in the original statement of St. Luke and our sole authority for them is St. Paul.'

'But, as St. Paul was earlier than the Gospels, surely this makes the evidence stronger that our Lord did intend to institute the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper?'

'Possibly. But it is a surprising fact that all three Synoptists should have recorded the Last Supper without mentioning the command. There is, I think, doubt

whether our Lord intended that Supper to develop into a service of the Church. The account of it, as given in the short and uninterpolated text of St. Luke, is a genuine historical record; but one cannot deduce from this fact that the Mass—or anything like it—was contained in the teaching of Christ.'

'But would you not admit,' I asked, 'that St. Paul wrote under the guidance of the Holy Spirit?'

'Certainly. But that does not imply that he was infallible in every detail. We know that the Faith spread among peoples to whom the mystery-religions were a commonplace; his environment influenced St. Paul, who was not a typical Pharisee but a Jew of the Dispersion. The Last Supper became associated in memory with the fellowship-meal of the early Christian community. The meal was the assertion, and hence the pledge, of unity in Christ; it became the Lord's Supper, and thus was insensibly likened to cult-meals of the mystery-religions. Within a century of Paul's death magical ideas from these faiths had corrupted its significance. Paul himself was able to keep his sacramentalism ethical, and normally avoided phrases suggestive of sacramental magic.'

The bishop continued: 'Because it blandly ignored the knowledge reached by modern critical study of the Gospels I was dissatisfied with the alternative Consecration Prayer of the Revised Prayer-book, now happily rejected. It was therein stated that our Lord *in His Holy Gospel* commanded us to continue the Last Supper as a perpetual memory of His death. There is no such command in the Gospels: we receive the command *according to St. Paul*, and ought to say so.'

'But, assuming for the moment that you are right, is it not true to say that the Gospel is more than the four gospels?'

'Yes; but the phrase used is liable to misunderstanding. It might well be taken to imply that one at least of the Evangelists had put on record that Jesus at the Last Supper commanded a repetition of the rite.

There is no such record. Forgive me for insisting on this; but I was brought up in a scientific atmosphere, and science does not tolerate evasive or misleading or merely careless language. Moreover, we cannot be too accurate in the language which we use in connexion with the Sacrament of Holy Communion. It is a deplorable fact that what ought to be the sacrament of Christian unity is in the English Church the centre of its most acute controversies. Careless language in official documents gives opportunities of which partisans are not slow to take advantage. It is well that I should say bluntly that, in my opinion, the chief danger to which English Churchmen are now exposed arises from the growth in our Church of puerile superstitions akin to Transubstantiation. Such growth is paralleled by the amazing increase of different types of superstition outside the Church. In fact religious crazes are growing in number and strength, and the turmoil is graver than we anticipated it would be ten years ago. I doubt whether circumstances will allow the Church more than some thirty years in which to reach unity. If by that time certain forms of superstition have not been eradicated, the Church of England will break up in the conflict between rational and magical religion. Whatever may happen in the Church, it seems to me certain that rational religion will triumph in the country as a whole, for I find that what may be called a Reformation as opposed to a Catholic view of the sacraments makes headway whenever controversy directs attention to fundamental issues. In the diocese of Birmingham, for instance, it is quite certain that remarkably few intelligent men or women accept any doctrine of sacramental magic.'

'Now may I be quite clear,' I interrupted, 'what you mean by "magic"? Take, for instance, the phrase—again from the Catechism—"taken and received." What do you mean by that?'

'I mean,' was the reply, 'that in Holy Communion we can realise the Presence of Christ Who gave Himself on

the Cross that humanity might perfect its service to, and communion with, God. This is certainly not to minimise the Sacrament, as some have suggested. Think for a moment—what else can possibly be meant by "receiving the Body and Blood of Christ"? Either the phrase is, as I contend, a metaphor, or you must maintain that the bread of communion is, by the prayer of consecration, actually made into the body of Christ. For such a transformation no shred of argument can be brought forward. Christ at the Last Supper said, with solemn prescience, "This is my body": and brake the bread to signify that on the next day His body would be broken on the Cross. But if it be true that He also said "Do this in remembrance of me," it is most certain that He did not make the promise that, whenever a priest should say similar words, a miracle would happen whereby some essence in the bread would be transformed into a spiritual reality. All sacraments are "vehicles" of grace. But the sacraments by which God gives us that grace which is knowledge of Himself are not merely two in number. They are infinitely various and never magical. In the Holy Communion no spiritual presence inheres in, or attaches itself to, the elements. To believe that a priest can thus associate a spiritual presence with an inanimate object is to accept magic. Such belief is essential to idolatry. A Hindu idol may be made in Birmingham and bought for a few rupees in an Eastern bazaar. The children will play with it with offence to none until it receives consecration by the priest. Then, as its devotees suppose, the spiritual presence of the divinity which it represents appears within it. I have been criticised for comparing Eucharistic magic to Hindu idolatry; but, as most missionaries know, the parallel is exact. We must sweep away such primitive fancies. They are harmful to humanity because they corrupt religion by falsehood. The essence of religion is to teach that God is revealed through goodness, beauty and truth, and that He is only rightly worshipped

as the worshipper helps to create these values in the world. I find a sacramental revelation in a wood carpeted with bluebells or in a blackthorn hedge on a May morning. To me scientific discovery is truly sacramental. When the 100-inch telescope at Mount Wilson sweeps the heavens and reveals the presence of uncounted millions of spiral nebulae, each an island universe, a fuller revelation of the grandeur of God's world is given. Is this not sacramental, an outward and visible sign of the might and majesty of God?'

I next asked Dr. Barnes what he meant by the statement which had given offence to many, that 'a wafer by itself has no more value than a penny placed in the hands of a dying man to pay his fare to the grim ferryman who shall take him across the Styx.'

'I meant,' replied the bishop, 'exactly what I said.'

'But do you attach no spiritual value to receiving the Sacrament in the hour of death?'

'I can well understand that a dying man would find comfort in taking the Holy Communion with those especially dear to him. It would be a symbol of their unity in Christ through Whom all who are His followers trust to find eternal life in the Kingdom of Heaven.'

'But suppose that you were alone?'

'Personally I should then feel no need of a priest or of the Eucharist. I do not fear God's justice or His mercy. My sins I could confess directly to God, and I know, as the story of the Prodigal Son teaches, that He will pardon all who repent. I feel no desire for priestly absolution and I could die, like Erasmus, without Communion at the last moment. The use of the Sacrament is to stimulate us, by a normal psychical reaction, to serve God and Christ in our earthly life. As to the nature of such service after death we know nothing.'

'But, even if none of your friends were present,' I asked, 'would you not regard it as an act of communion with God?'

'I can only repeat that personally I see no need of such

a method of approach to God in the hour of death. He is our Father: as we go to Him, we go home. In the light of such simplicities, priests and sacraments are merely irrelevant. I would go further and say that they may become dangerous irrelevancies. Primitive fancies remain strong. The Eucharistic bread, as early as the second century of the Christian era, was described by a respectable Church Father with what to us is painful credulity as "the medicine of immortality." Is there no danger to-day of the revival of the magical belief that there is in a consecrated wafer some spiritual power by which safety after death can be assured? Prayer and repentance together form a complete preparation for death. For this reason the Church of England has no use for the veiled paganism associated in Roman Catholic teaching with the *viaticum*.'

We passed on to discuss the rejection of the Revised Prayer-book by the House of Commons. As I had expected, Dr. Barnes regarded it as no misfortune for the Church that the book had failed to pass.

'The Revised Prayer-book,' he said, 'was an unsuccessful compromise, doctrinally invertebrate. Some of the most important rubrics, as drafted, would have involved the Diocesan in grave administrative difficulties. On issues like the use of incense the book was merely evasive. Under its provisions there would have been no effective way of securing that continuous reservation was limited to churches where it was needed, and would be solely used, for the sick alone. Illegal services associated with continuous reservation would probably have increased.'

'As to the future,' I asked, 'what would you say to the suggestion that the bishops should license either of the two rejected books for use in churches?'

'It seems to me inconceivable that they could do so, now that Parliament has rejected both of them. The bishops are placed in their office to obey the law of the land. Were they to disobey it, a feeling of anger would

spread through the community. The House of Commons has rightly interpreted the general feeling of the country in refusing to sanction reservation. It made the refusal because the practice is associated with errors akin to Transubstantiation. Were the bishops now to countenance reservation, there would rightly be a widespread feeling that they were trying to undo the Reformation settlement. A strong disestablishment movement would arise, and to it there would be joined proposals for drastic disendowment. In short, the Church of England may have its endowments or Transubstantiation: it cannot have both.'

'But do you not think that there will be an increase in disorder, now that the Church's proposals for dealing with it have been rejected?'

'Well, there could not very well be more disorder than at present, could there?'

'At any rate,' I replied, 'we are left exactly where we were before, with an utterly discredited method of enforcing order. Do you think that public opinion would stand wholesale prosecution of the clergy? If not, how do you propose that discipline should be administered?'

'I suggest that neither the Ecclesiastical Commissioners nor Queen Anne's Bounty should pay sums due from them towards the stipend of any clergyman till a declaration had been received, signed by the incumbent of the parish and countersigned by the bishop, stating that the conduct of services in his church during the previous six months had been according to the law.'

'But surely,' I protested, 'this is exactly the wrong method? You are only substituting one kind of force for another. Would not the wiser course be to revive synodical action in the dioceses, and for the bishop to take the synod of his clergy into his confidence? Very few incumbents would continue to withstand the corporate opinion of their fellow-clergymen.'

'I think,' replied the bishop, 'that this would be of

little use in the long run. For one thing, the synods would not be representative. The laity should be consulted in matters of administration, and doctrine is a matter for scholars.'

'I should have thought that doctrine and administration frequently overlap. But let me return to my point about the synods. Take the case of a man who refuses, let us say, to obey his bishop's ruling with regard to discontinuing certain services. Would not the bishop's hands be enormously strengthened if he could go to his synod and say: Here is a priest who refuses to obey the law of the Church . . . ?'

'No, no,' interrupted the bishop, 'the law of England. Do please get that point fixed in your mind. The bishops are placed in office, as I have already said, to administer the law of the land. Now, when a clergyman is instituted to a benefice, he solemnly undertakes to use in public worship the services of the Prayer-book and none other. He also swears that he will give due and canonical obedience to his bishop in all things lawful and honest. He obtains his benefice on these conditions. If he were not willing to give such a pledge and to take such an oath, he would not be made an incumbent. I say then that if, after institution, he proceeds to use other services than those of the Prayer-book and to flout his bishop's protests, he ought not to receive his stipend. In such circumstances it should be possible for the bishop —there would, of course, be a right of appeal to the Archbishop or ultimately to the High Court—to prevent the payment of stipend. If a disloyal clergyman could, without an official stipend, maintain himself by the aid of such a congregation as he could gather, I would, somewhat illogically, leave him to go his own way until he died. Naturally, before instituting another minister to a parish with such an unfortunate history, the bishop would demand personal assurances of loyalty to the law. He would, I conceive, ask for a statement from the incoming minister that he regarded both the Declaration

of Assent and the Oath of Canonical Obedience as solemn obligations and not empty formalities.'

'But surely you have no right to demand that a clergyman should sign any such statement?'

'I do not know what the lawyers would say: the existing law rests on the natural assumption that declarations and oaths impose solemn obligations. But I am clear in my own mind as to the course to be taken. As bishop I have to maintain sound doctrine "as this Church and Realm have received the same." I do not press that the clergy of my diocese should pay meticulous regard to the forms of the Prayer-book: but it is my duty to see that no variations are made which imply false doctrine or involve serious departures from the appointed order. Moreover, it is for me, as bishop, to demand this general conformity to the law: an incumbent has no right to disregard alike the law and his bishop's injunctions. If any man is presented to me, for institution to a benefice, who intends to be a law unto himself, I will refuse institution. If the patrons then take legal proceedings I shall, as a good Churchman, refuse to defend my action; and in the end I shall go to prison for contempt of court. As soon as this shall happen, an invincible movement will arise for the strengthening of the bishop's powers to enforce the law.

'But to return to the Prayer-book,' Dr. Barnes continued, 'some attempt should have been made to meet the intellectual objections of the age. The doctrine of the Virgin Birth offends many of our younger people, especially, I find, those who are university students. Could we not have on Christmas Day a collect alternative to that which now irritates many who are profoundly Christian in temper and faith? The whole question of the creeds should have been more carefully considered. The Apostles' Creed has no ecumenical authority and might well be made alternative to some simple modern creed such as that drawn by Dr. Major from the Fourth Gospel. The so-called Nicene Creed of our Communion

Office might well be replaced by the genuine creed of Nicæa, which is more simple and, in the opinion of many, more satisfactory. I did not dislike the treatment accorded to the so-called Athanasian Creed. It is a valuable document because of its balance, and because of the way in which it corrects popular tritheism. But no one, as Archbishop Tait said, takes the deplorable damnatory clauses in their plain and literal sense. I therefore desire to reject these clauses and to retain the creed as an ancient standard of doctrine. Obviously it is unsuited for use in congregational worship.'

Most of the above will be familiar to all who have heard Dr. Barnes preach or have read his printed works. And I was anxious to obtain from him some statement on the positive teaching which he thinks it is the duty of the Church to emphasise at this time.

'The situation,' he replied, 'is one of very grave confusion; and, generally speaking, I should say that we have to create a new *Zeitgeist*. We are still in the backwash of the war. The desire for pleasure is predominant. Again, although the very young cannot remember the war, they have received and accepted the tradition of their elders that the Church has failed. And so it has. Think, for instance, of the attitude of our Church in August, 1914.'

'Then you think we should have protested against joining the war?'

'Yes. Personally, I did protest; and my subsequent ecclesiastical difficulties have been nothing compared to what I had to go through then. But, before we can create the new spirit of the age, present perplexities concerning the formulae of religion must be diminished. We need to restate our faith in the light of modern historical and scientific criticism. We ought to reformulate the whole Anglican position.'

'Is not the Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine engaged on this very work?' I asked.

'Yes; but some of the leading theologians of our communion are not on that Commission. At present many of our best men are silent on some of the most important issues that face us. They fear, not without reason, misrepresentation or abuse. Because the work of restatement cannot be done corporately, every encouragement and freedom should be given to individuals of intellectual eminence and spiritual enthusiasm. Only if our great thinkers are protected by the outspoken approval of the episcopate can the Church be preserved from superstition-mongers in whom a certain verbal dexterity conceals woeful poverty of thought.

'No Church can remain healthy and, I would add, national if it ignores the new knowledge of its era. Think how much better it would have been for the Church had its leading thinkers come to terms with liberal ideas in the third decade of the nineteenth century. Commonplaces of to-day, such as the critical investigation of the Scriptures, the past geological ages of the earth, and progressive sociology, challenged the static complacency of the Church. The Tractarians took the wrong turning and began a movement which has been almost wholly harmful.'

'But do you not see in that movement,' I asked, 'a revolt against indifference and against a low conception of the Church's office and calling?'

'No,' Dr. Barnes replied with emphasis. 'If you read the "Tracts for the Times" you will see that the movement was a definite attempt to stem the flowing tide of Liberalism. But let us return to the present day. I believe that one of the first results of such a reformulation as that for which I hope would be that the Church would express the religious significance of the new knowledge of our era; and would then be enabled to appeal persuasively to the understanding and moral conscience of the nation. In this way the Church would cause men to be inspired anew by those parts of the Bible which are of especial spiritual value. Revision of the Prayer-book

would largely cease to be controversial as general agreement gradually emerged. During an era of free criticism, which must necessarily precede reconstruction, there would be theological controversy. Such expert controversy I regard as alike necessary and healthy; what does harm is the reckless and embittered ignorance of blind partisans. In the end we might thus re-establish what might best be described as the new Anglican outlook, a common group of presuppositions, beliefs and sympathies.'

'And now,' I asked, 'may we discuss in detail the results of such a reformulation as you propose? What are the fundamental truths of religion which you think should receive a fresh emphasis?'

'First,' was the reply, 'I would place the Fatherhood of God. I prefer "Fatherhood" to "Love." There is a severe side to the character of God which the idea of Fatherhood retains. As is well known, leaders of modern physical and biological science show a distinct recoil from mechanical concepts of development. But they are naturally led to a somewhat colourless pantheism if they confine attention to scientific research. I would have the Church of England show the necessity of passing from such pantheism to belief in God as our Father.

'Secondly, I would have the Church preach Jesus as the Christ, One Whom the modern world can rightly regard as the Anointed of God. If the Church had in the past done its duty in this matter we should not be lamenting so frequently the appearance of another incredibly bad "Life of Christ." But we shall not spread the influence and teaching of Jesus so long as we ignore the results of critical study of the New Testament. Liberal Protestantism presents the world with an idealist social reformer. Catholicism puts forward the central figure of a mystery-religion. We need to present, instead of such fancies, the Son of Man. We must emphasise, moreover, that behind Him were the great Hebrew prophets with their ethical monotheism. I

distrust the movement among us which disparages the Old Testament. We may rightly ignore Jehovah, God of Battles, the fierce tribal deity of early Israel. But we cannot ignore the great succession of teachers from Amos onwards who led the most significant religious advance (for I include Christianity among its fruits) in human history. Moreover, if the Hebrew element in Christianity be disregarded, other elements within it, which were in origin Hellenic or more probably Iberian, become over-emphasised. The man who stands on the shoulders of Amos or Micah to look at Christ will not be seduced by magical sacramentalism.

'Thirdly, I wish to urge that the ethical content of the Gospel should be more simply and courageously proclaimed by the Church. We relegate the Beatitudes to the Gospel for All Saints' Day. We ought to have them Sunday by Sunday to make men understand the mind of Jesus Christ. After all, He is the peculiar glory of the Christian religion.'

'Now here, Bishop,' I broke in, 'I want to pick up your words "peculiar to the Christian religion." After all, what is there distinctively Christian in all this? May I be pardoned for saying that I am reminded of a story George Russell once told me? He said that he had among his friends an orthodox Jewess, who declared that she had sat under Dean Stanley at Westminster Abbey for four years, and that during all that time she had never heard him make one single statement that she could not wholeheartedly accept.'

'I would reply that much teaching now put forward as "distinctively Christian" is little better than disguised paganism. The language and ideas of the ancient mystery-religions, with a little Christian colour-wash, are set forth as the Catholic Faith. Christ, were He among us, would be astonished at many doctrines preached in His name and, still more, at the emphasis laid on liturgical forms and ecclesiastical customs foreign to His thought. Can you imagine that He would accept any sort of

mechanism of Atonement or Salvation? Christ taught us how the soul of man can find its way to God without rite or ceremony: all that man needs to do is to rise above the sensuality and selfishness that shut out God. The simpler our worship and the more direct our access to God, the nearer are we to the Teacher Who preferred the hill-side to the synagogue, and Whose most significant act in the Temple was to cleanse it.'

'Very well,' I said, 'I have your three main points. Now, is there anything further that you think should be stressed in our teaching?'

'Yes,' replied the bishop, 'there are also three great social enthusiasms to be kept in the foreground. The first of these is Peace. The Church of England ought to be the foremost advocate of peace in the country. We ought to appeal for disarmament in the knowledge that peace can only come through disarmament. Disarmament would, of course, be dangerous; but in the present temper of the world we can only get the cessation of war, which is vitally necessary to civilised progress, by taking dangerous risks. I wish that the clergy would learn how utterly horrible the next war, with its aeroplanes and poison-gases, will be. I wish that they would spread a knowledge of the uselessness and brutality of war. It is a monstrous anachronism.

'In the second place,' Dr. Barnes continued, 'I would have the Church understand the necessity of eugenic reform. We shall not establish the Kingdom of God in England by breeding, as at present, more largely from the unfit than from the fit. The increase of inferior stocks and, in particular, of the feeble-minded is a grave social menace.'

'Are you then,' I asked, 'an advocate of birth prevention?'

'I know nothing in Christ's teaching,' was the reply, 'nor in the teaching of the Church to forbid the use of methods recommended by a physician for the purpose of birth control. Husband and wife are justified in

regulating alike the number of their children and the time-intervals between them. The community, moreover, has the right to take measures to prevent the birth of children likely to be tainted by epilepsy, feeble-mindedness, or lunacy. Such throughout their lives are a burden to the State. They increase the already heavy cost of our social services. If there were less pressure from the unfit, the better stocks in the community would be more prolific.

'Finally, the Church must support with wide and discriminating sympathy all efforts for social welfare such as old-age pensions, unemployment insurance and the like. They are costly and we can only afford them because modern machinery is enormously productive. The recent development of these forms of State-aided social service has been so rapid that a reaction against the spending of such large sums is not unlikely. The Church should show no sympathy with such reaction. It ought rather to seek so to influence legislation as to prevent the inheritance, if it cannot prevent the growth, of large fortunes. Furthermore, the Church should use all its influence to preserve the unspoiled beauty of England. Industry is now spreading southward. Its leaders ought not to be allowed to create in Southern England the squalid ugliness which has defaced the industrial North.'

The above is, I trust, a fairly faithful reproduction of the positive elements in Dr. Barnes's teaching. But there were still one or two problems on which I wished to learn his views; and we had a few words on the subject of empty churches. The bishop thought it just possible that we might have to centralise our efforts, like the Wesleyans, though he recognised fully the social value of parochial organisations, and deprecated the loss that would be incurred if they were curtailed or abandoned. 'On the other hand,' he continued, 'I look for a revival of the desire for public worship. We may not get an

increase in the number of those who attend early celebrations of the Holy Communion. But Morning Prayer and Evensong will renew their appeal. I think that it may be desirable to modify these latter services to meet changing desires; we might, for instance, introduce directed prayer and also have organised silence for meditation. But kinds of worship other than sacramental suit the religious temperament of the Englishman. Therein the Nordic differs from the Iberian; he is normally more uplifted in spirit by Evensong than by the Holy Communion. Not that he has no reverence for the Sacrament. He instinctively regards it as a great expression of corporate unity, especially suited to particular occasions. But I think he has still to learn that the associations of the Eucharist are such as to invest it, when rightly taught, with a specially solemn appeal. It continues the Last Supper, and so brings us very near the Cross.

'But I am sure,' added the bishop, 'that a growing sensitiveness to hygienic standards will in the end lead us to give up the use of a common cup. We might substitute intinction, or separate cups, or Communion in one kind. Personally, I have no objection to the last; but it is the Roman practice, and therefore suspect.'

We were then led to talk a little of reunion. For reunion with Rome Dr. Barnes has neither desire nor hope. But he would welcome unity with the Nonconformist bodies in England. He regretted the temporary deadlock in negotiations between the leaders of the Church of England and those of the Free Churches. 'But,' he added, 'I hope that it is only temporary. Let us continue to break down the barriers that separate us. I desire to add inter-communion to interchange of pulpits. Inter-communion should, of course, be between those who are "working towards reunion" in the temper of the Appeal of the Lambeth Conference of 1920. Otherwise it would be a mockery. But those who desire reunion should not only pray together; they

should take the Lord's Supper together. It is the common meal of the Christian Churches. There is no law of the Church to prevent a Churchman from attending a Nonconformist Communion service, or a Nonconformist from occasionally receiving Communion in an Anglican Church.'

'What about the rubric at the end of the Confirmation service?' I asked.

'I think I can answer that best,' was the reply, 'by referring you to a letter of Mandell Creighton's.' The bishop went to one of his bookshelves and took down the second volume of the 'Life and Letters.' 'Here it is —"We must recognise," wrote Creighton, "that the rubric at the end of the Confirmation service deals with the normal case of a baptised member of the Church of England. When members of other bodies attend our services and are gradually drawn towards them . . . they may be regarded as fit for Confirmation in spiritual knowledge, and may therefore be admitted to Communion." I think that Creighton's ruling could be rightly applied to all who are working towards reunion in the spirit of the Lambeth Appeal.'

THE RIGHT REVEREND GUY WARMAN, BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD

'WHO is the Bishop of Chelmsford?' I was once asked by a Member of Parliament, as we left the House of Lords together after a debate on a Church Assembly Measure that had been passed by a small majority. 'It was his speech,' my friend added, 'that did most to get the Measure through.' This was quite true. Dr. Warman had given their Lordships a few statements of fact—of which the English peer is no less fond than the commoner—in a very precise and entirely unemotional speech, which made a considerable impression on many members of the House. I gave my inquirer a brief sketch of the bishop's career; of his work in the North as parish priest and teacher, of his (rather unexpected) appointment to the Bishopric of Truro and of his translation to Chelmsford. He was not then so prominent in the counsels of the bishops as he became later, especially during the discussions of the Bench on the revised Prayer-book, when Dr. Warman's knowledge and judgment proved invaluable. Nor had he then decided to return to the North; and it was only a few days before his translation to Manchester was announced that I had the privilege of a talk with the bishop, when he left a committee at the C.M.S. House in Salisbury Square to give me half an hour of his time, and we discussed the steps to be taken as a result of the second rejection of the Prayer-book by the House of Commons.

The bishop seemed disappointed, but not depressed. He was unshaken in his conviction that the 1928 book

would have been administratively workable, and that its provisions were elastic enough to have enabled the various parties in the Church to settle down to a period of peace and co-operation. Nor did he consider the crisis so acute as it had seemed to some of those who had heard the Archbishop of Canterbury's declaration at the summer session of the Church Assembly.

I began by asking Dr. Warman about one sentence in that declaration which appeared to me to interpret rather too charitably the decision of the House of Commons. It was a mistaken view, in Dr. Davidson's judgment, to conclude that 'the House of Commons is arrogantly claiming to take in hand the absolute control of the belief and worship of the Church of England.' I asked whether the bishop thought it possible, after reading the official report of the debates, to believe anything else. One member after another—including the most prominent speakers like Sir William Joynson-Hicks, Sir Thomas Inskip, Mr. Rosslyn Mitchell and others—had declared that reservation of the Sacrament was the crux of the situation; and that, if a new book were presented with certain sections omitted, they would not be prepared to oppose its passage through the House. What was this, I asked, but a declaration on the part of the House of Commons that it would permit members of the Church of England to worship in one way and not in another, or in other words to control the worship of the Church?

'I think,' replied the bishop, 'that is only one side of it. You may, perhaps, fairly say that a few of the protagonists had this in mind, but a considerable number voted against the resolution in the belief that they were really expressing the opinions of a majority within the National Church. These persons they regarded as voiceless and as not adequately represented in the Church Assembly, and, in casting their vote against the Measure, they considered primarily that they were giving effect to the wishes of the majority of

the constituents (even of the Anglican constituents) whom they represent at St. Stephen's.'

'That would not be your own view?'

'No,' replied the bishop. 'It is true that some of the Evangelicals were bitterly opposed to the book, and that a large number of Anglo-Catholics were either hostile or indifferent. But I still regard the book as true to the best traditions of Anglicanism. The new Prayer-book is in some respects more evangelical than the old one. The new Communion Office gives a larger place to thanksgiving and worship, but in its teaching remains remarkably loyal to the doctrine of the indwelling Spirit of Christ. But the truth is that Sir William Joynson-Hicks's theory of Anglicanism is hardly compatible with the conditions of the Anglican Communion as they have developed during the last half-century, and as they are to-day. Sir Thomas Inskip would, I think, have been prepared to concede reservation under very strict limitations, but he was afraid that, if the book were approved, the bishops would not be able to prevent the spread of the cultus of the reserved Sacrament. Sir William, on the other hand, seems to find no room at all for any Anglo-Catholic within the National Church.'

'May I go back for a moment,' I interrupted, 'to the House of Commons? You will remember that in their December statement the Archbishops expressed their belief that the vote in the House of Commons had been "influenced by certain avoidable misunderstandings." In spite of their efforts to remove these, the second vote of the House was no less decisive than the first. Does it not look as if the bishops had misjudged the situation?'

'If you put it in that way, perhaps,' the bishop admitted. 'But really the misunderstanding goes much farther back. Most of us, I think, were under the impression that the decisive step in all the procedure connected with the Enabling Act and Church Assembly

Measures would be the vote of the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament. We imagined that, once that Committee had decided that any Measure did not affect "the constitutional rights of His Majesty's subjects," the House of Commons would give it a smooth passage; and that the considerations of the House would be almost entirely confined to this single aspect of Assembly Measures. In other words, that the assent of Parliament would seldom be more than a formality, after a favourable verdict from the Ecclesiastical Committee. That was the important misunderstanding, and we are paying for it now.'

I then reminded the bishop of another passage in the December statement, in which the Archbishops had declared that 'there are circumstances in which it would be the bishops' duty to take action in accordance with the Church's inherent spiritual authority. We realise that duty, and are ready, if need be, to fulfil it.' Had not those circumstances now arisen?

'I think perhaps they have,' replied Dr. Warman; 'but you must not think that we are going to fail in our duty. The only point on which we should be in disagreement with some of our critics is concerned with the best time and method of fulfilling it. We should not have been justified, in June, in taking any serious steps without giving much fuller consideration than could be devoted to the matter at the end of a very trying and tiring year.'

'What, then,' I asked, 'is the next step to be? I suppose that you would rule out the desirability of gaining our independence through Disestablishment?'

'Yes,' was the emphatic reply, 'and for more than one reason. First, people sit so loosely nowadays to institutional religion that I should hesitate to advocate anything that might encourage this tendency; and there is a danger that Disestablishment would lead to an almost complete secularisation. This is exactly the wrong time to choose at which to curtail in any way

the national recognition of religion. Secondly, whether Disestablishment be inevitable or not, the parties and schools of thought within the Church are not yet near enough to one another to enable us to make the best use of the freedom we should gain by it. Disestablishment would not only mean the severing of Church and State: it might even lead to the disruption of the Church of England. We are drawing nearer to one another every day, but our differences are still too acute to risk the danger of a possible schism.'

'What, then, is the next step?'

'I think our first effort should be to attempt to alter, or indeed very carefully to reconsider, the whole procedure under the Enabling Act. As you know, the Assembly proceeds by Measures which are sent to Parliament for approval, and also by Resolutions for the validity of which Parliamentary sanction is not required. We must have a larger freedom in matters of worship; it would be a great advantage to have reasonable opportunity of experiment; and the committee of statesmen and churchmen, to the appointment of which the Archbishop looked forward in his speech to the Church Assembly, will consider this point—whether, that is, decisions relating to the Church's worship can be withdrawn from the category of those matters that are at present dealt with by Measure and require Parliamentary approval, and can be treated by Resolution instead. This would give us the undertaking we need, that within certain limits the Church shall have a larger freedom in settling its own internal affairs.'

'But surely,' I protested, 'this is simply to cry for the moon. Parliament has twice refused us permission to settle certain details of worship. Is it likely that it will give us *carte blanche* in the future, in every matter affecting public worship? In other words, does it not amount to this—that, after Parliament has refused to honour two of our bills, we are going to ask it to give us a blank cheque?'

'It may perhaps look like that for the moment. But I do not think that is the whole truth, and the question will be fully considered by the new committee. The blank cheque could be limited in amount. At any rate, we are bound to leave no stone unturned to avoid a clash just now between Church and State.'

'And suppose,' I asked, 'that the effort is not successful?'

'Then,' Dr. Warman replied, 'we may have to take other action. But one step at a time, especially at such a time as this, is enough.'

'And now,' I went on, 'I should like, if I may, to discuss the position and policy of the bishops during the next year or so. What do you propose to do, in view of the decision of the House of Commons, in administering your own diocese?'

'In the first place,' said the bishop, 'we shall take counsel with the clergy and the elected representatives of the laity in my diocese—with the synod, that is, and the Lay House. We shall ask their advice, and shall naturally treat it with the most careful consideration. We shall do nothing without consulting our people and, of course, our brother bishops, and by what is then decided we shall ask the diocese to abide.'

'And suppose that you and your brother bishops decide to deal, let us say, with the question of reservation in accordance with the rubrics and provisions of either of the new books, would not that constitute a challenge to the State?'

'Not necessarily. It depends a good deal on how things are done. Recall the facts. The Royal Commission gave its considered opinion that the law of public worship is too narrow for this generation. That was more than twenty years ago. We, the bishops, after the fullest consultation with the Church, found a standard which we regarded as fair and workable. Parliament has disagreed with us, while being fully aware that we cannot administer the present law. We

can do no more than our best in continuing to administer it, and if in doing so we find ourselves at variance with Parliament, it is for Parliament to decide how serious that variance is.

'Look at it,' continued the bishop, 'in this way. There are certain laws governing the speed and method of motor traffic on the highway. The Home Secretary cannot, as everybody knows, enforce them. Suppose that a law were introduced attempting to regulate afresh in the light of to-day's needs, and were thrown out, the Home Secretary would be able to do nothing except to try to go on administering the existing law with as much common sense as possible. The analogy is almost exact. We bishops can do no more than go on administering the existing law, if Parliament will not allow us to have it altered. I do not altogether blame the Home Secretary for the fact that the motor laws are not obeyed; and I have a right to expect that a similar indulgence will be extended to me.

'Further, we cannot repeat too often that the provisions of the old book are universally disobeyed. There is hardly a single church in which it is possible to worship without breaking the law, and it is often in the most "live" parishes—and those by no means all Anglo-Catholic parishes—that this disobedience is to be noticed. Last week I attended the Holy Communion in a College chapel. The celebrant, the Master of the College, broke the law four times. On the same day I attended a morning service in the church of a well-known evangelical opponent of the book; he broke the law seven times. In fact, it is only in my own chapel at Chelmsford that the law is obeyed.'

'But surely,' I interrupted rather mischievously, 'in your own chapel the exhortation immediately preceding the invitation is not read at every celebration of the Holy Communion?'

'No,' replied the bishop with a smile; 'I am afraid that that is true.'

'And now,' I continued, 'here is another difficulty that I should like to mention. Suppose that one of your incumbents who has never yet reserved the Sacrament wrote to you to say that he proposed to do so in the future, and urged in excuse either that as a parish priest he had an inherent right to reserve, or that the bishops had already accepted the principle of reservation in both of the new books, what would you say?'

'I should reply, first, that a parish priest has no "inherent" right of the kind; and if he were to plead evidence to the contrary, I should retort by informing him that no less learned an Anglo-Catholic leader than Dr. Kidd is by no means convinced that parish priests have such a right. God's Board is as much under the care of the bishop as of the incumbent—*Accipe curam tuam ac meam*—and only the bishop can give him the right to reserve the Sacrament. To the second plea I should reply by reminding the incumbent that the bishops were only agreed on the desirability of reserving the Sacrament when they were "satisfied of the need" for doing so. And, lastly, it would surely be a little unchivalrous of him to place his bishop in an extremely difficult position at a time like this. As to the bishop's rights, it may be noted that in the case of a Mission church he can of course withdraw his licence altogether and shut the church, as the Holy Communion is only administered in such a building by express permission of the bishop.'

'One other point,' I added. 'Suppose that one of the extreme Protestant societies, let us say, were to threaten prosecution of one of your clergy for disobeying the law?'

'Well, as you know, the bishop has the right in certain circumstances to veto any prosecution of the kind. If the alleged offence were something entirely extravagant, such as the holding of Corporate Devotions before the reserved Sacrament, I should be inclined to permit it; for a man who breaks the law of the Anglican

Church can hardly expect the protection of the Anglican Episcopate. If, however, it was something that came within the four corners of the new books, I should be inclined to forbid it. For we must, I repeat, have a larger measure of freedom than we have to-day, or the Establishment will not stand the strain. Let me say, however, that I hate the thought of prosecution within the family life of the Church. I believe that the best appeal just now is the appeal to loyalty.'

'And do you think that the parties in the Church are drawing nearer to one another?'

'Surely there is no doubt of it. At the Cromer Convention a few weeks ago, the degree of unity manifested was amazing; and several High Church clergy came to believe that their own sacramental doctrines were not very far away from those of the Evangelicals. The main hope is that the liberals of both wings—Evangelical and Catholic—and moderate people may see how much they hold in common, and perhaps work out a common policy. I, for instance, am a liberal Evangelical; my brother the Bishop of Southwark would, I imagine, call himself a liberal Catholic. Yet we can understand each other's point of view, and work happily and agreeably together. This means that, though we may not agree on every detail of belief, we can agree on a course of policy.'

'And what,' was my final question, 'of the extremists at both ends?'

'About them,' was the reply, 'I fear there is nothing much that is hopeful to be said. The Protestantism that is political rather than spiritual will certainly die out. And the Catholicism that takes no account of our Anglican tradition has really no place in the Church of England. When I read a notice, hanging outside the chapel of a church in which the Sacrament is reserved —"God is in this chapel"—I see clearly where the dividing line can be drawn. It seems to me quite impossible to connect the cultus of the reserved Sacrament

with the last scene in the Upper Room. Expressions such as "paying visits to Jesus"—as children are sometimes exhorted to do—are very far away from the spiritual conception of religion taught by our Lord. Anything that suggests the absence of God except in a particular place encourages the cultus, and takes us farther away from true religion. It reminds me of my church in Bradford, where men and women could often be found saying their prayers at all hours of the day, but of which a visitor once said to me—"What a pity that your church is empty." And when I asked what was meant, the answer came—"You have not our dear Lord's Presence."'

I should add that the bishop was naturally unwilling to answer some of the questions I put to him on the Prayer-book, until the bishops had held the meeting at which their future policy will be decided in September. That meeting will be critical for the relations of Church and State in this land, and, until it is over, it is perhaps wise for lesser men to hold their peace.

Printed in England at THE BALLANTYNE PRESS
SPOTTISWOODE, BALLANTYNE & CO. LTD.
Colchester, London & Eton

Date Due			
AG 7 '46			
MY 24 '50			

BW5166 .I65
Men and movements in the church;
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00017 7602